1015

UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
NOTTINGHAM

Author DURUY

Class Mark DC 38·D8

Book No. 6003298456

UNIVERSITY
OF NOTTINGHAM
LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM
60 0329845 6
TELEPEN
FROM THE LIBRARY

Everyman, I will go with thee, and be thy guide,
In thy most need to go by thy side.

This is No. 737 of Everyman's Library. A list of authors and their works in this series will be found at the end of this volume. The publishers will be pleased to send freely to all applicants a separate, annotated list of the Library.

J. M. DENT & SONS LIMITED
10–13 BEDFORD STREET LONDON W.C.2

E. P. DUTTON & CO. INC.
286–302 FOURTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY
EDITED BY ERNEST RHYS

HISTORY

A SHORT HISTORY OF FRANCE
BY VICTOR DURUY · APPENDIX
(1871–1914) BY LUCY MENZIES
INTRODUCTION BY R. WILSON
IN 2 VOLS. VOL. I

VICTOR DURUY, born in 1811 in Paris, the son of an artisan. Educated at the École Normale Supérieure and was appointed tutor to two sons of King Louis Philippe in 1833 and later became a professor at the Collège Henry IV. Led educational reform as Minister of Education, 1863–9. Elected to the Assembly, 1884. Died in 1894.

A SHORT HISTORY OF FRANCE

VOLUME ONE

VICTOR DURUY

NOTTINGHAM UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

LONDON: J. M. DENT & SONS LTD.
NEW YORK: E. P. DUTTON & CO. INC.

All rights reserved

Made in Great Britain
at The Temple Press Letchworth
and decorated by Eric Ravilious
for
J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd.
Aldine House Bedford St. London
Toronto . Vancouver
Melbourne . Wellington
First Published in this Edition 1917
Reprinted 1918, 1928

NOTTINGHAM
PUBLIC LIBRARIES.
ASPLEY.
CLASS .....
ACCESSION ...6220.....
DATE .....14.5.37.....

ST.	AC.	CL	CA	EX.
	14			

cC

X760018463

Date Jan. 1967
Ad. Fast Collection

329845

INTRODUCTION

It is customary for a biographer to pay some particular attention to a great man's ancestry according to the flesh. It would be well if more attention were occasionally paid to his intellectual descent. The ancestry of Jean Victor Duruy in this respect is of special interest, for the French historian was in the direct line with men of no less distinction than Michelet and Guizot.

The lives of these three historians cover a period of rather more than a century, and that one of the most eventful and significant in history, whether ancient or modern. Their dates are:

Guizot, 1787–1874
Michelet, 1798–1874
Duruy, 1811–1894

so that their joint period covers not only the French Revolution and the succeeding world-upheaval but brings us down to two decades beyond the Franco-German War and within twenty years of the greatest of all world contests. If the three men had confined their intellectual and literary attention to their own times they would have had more than enough material upon which to exercise their marvellous gifts as historians.

It is not our present business to trace the interesting story of the life of Guizot or the fascinating biography of Michelet, but to show the nature of the connection between these two men and Duruy. The last-named was born only a few months before Guizot was made professor of modern history at the Sorbonne, where, by his first course of lectures, he began the great modern revival of historical research in France. Some eighteen years later Michelet became deputy professor under Guizot in the literary faculty of the university and at the same time began the composition of his *Histoire de France*. Duruy had studied under Michelet at the *École Normale Supérieure* and at the age of twenty-four acted as his deputy at the school and accompanied him on his travels in search of

historical material. Together the three men are largely responsible for the marked advance in historical knowledge which distinguished France among the nations in the nineteenth century, and what is more important, for the inauguration of historical method of the most precise scientific character. It is worth noting in passing that Guizot published in the early part of his career a translation of Gibbon, was at one time a refugee in England, a warm friend of Lord Aberdeen, an advocate no less warm of the *entente cordiale* long before the phrase had become familiar in Britain, and wrote one of the best histories of our own Civil War extant.[1]

Duruy was a Parisian by birth, the son of an artisan at the factory of Gobelins (Michelet, by the way, was the son of a master-printer, while Guizot also sprang from the middle class). He was at first intended for the factory, but he quickly showed such outstanding intellectual ability and distinguished himself so greatly at the *École Normale Supérieure* that this plan was given up and he was left free to prepare himself for teaching, which is work that is highly honoured in France. He passed quickly to the higher branch of educational work, but as quickly paid for his precocity. In a very short time ill-health compelled him to resign his post at the *École Normale*, and when he had sufficiently recovered he looked about for the means of making a living and found it in the writing of school-books. It is possible that the plan was suggested by Michelet, who had himself edited and written books of this class in the early part of his career. Duruy put his best efforts into the work and his secondary text-books soon won for him no small measure of public notice. The comparative seclusion of this period had benefited his health and he now felt able to accept the offer of a chair in the *Collège Henry IV.*, which he held for over a quarter of a century.

Meanwhile, he had been pursuing his historical studies with great ardour, and at the age of thirty-two he published his *Histoire des Romains et des Peuples soumis à leur Domination*. This work was the product of indefatigable research, and yet, to the surprise of large numbers of his fellow-countrymen, was very readable. The two-volume edition of this book, issued 1843–44, was really only a beginning of his *magnum opus*. In spite of numerous other duties he found time during the middle period of his career to pursue his researches still further, and he published, between 1877 and 1885, a seven-volume

[1] *Histoire de la révolution d'Angleterre depuis Charles Ier à Charles II.*

edition with the title *Histoire des Romains depuis les Temps les plus Reculés jusqu'à la Mort de Theodòse.* Upon this work rests his fame as a scientific historian and it was his interest in the Romans which led to his becoming a statesman and accomplishing work of the utmost benefit to his countrymen. Napoleon III. had made a study of the career of Julius Caesar and needed assistance in his task of research. He enlisted the help of the author of the *Histoire des Romains* and was so much impressed with his abilities that in 1863 he made him Minister of Education.

Duruy's work for the schools had already filled him with an ardent desire for educational reform, and in his general attitude towards this great question he followed the lead of Michelet, who, a quarter of a century before, had conducted a spirited campaign against the increased Jesuit activity of the later thirties, lecturing against the clerical party with such fire and eloquence that the government had been forced to stop him because his impassioned advocacy of the secular solution threatened to lead to breaches of the peace. Duruy also earned for himself the bitter opposition of the clerical party, but he held on his way in spite of it. He remodelled the system of higher education, took steps to draw teachers and educationists together in conference so that they might discuss their work and enlighten each other; drew up a course of higher education for girls under secular teachers; and insisted upon the efficient teaching of modern history and languages in both the colleges and the *lycées.* He also meant to make elementary education free and compulsory, but although he greatly improved the system of primary instruction he was not allowed to carry out the wider plan. He relinquished his educational administrative work in 1869 and after the fall of the empire he took no further part in the control of public affairs. He was elected to the assembly in 1884 and died ten years later.

The influence of Duruy's educational experience and enthusiasm is evident in all his literary work. He is concerned not only to discover facts and causes, but also to transmit his information in such a shape that it can be readily assimilated by those who have not trodden the same intellectual path as himself. He is not content to find out the truth and leave it lying about in disjointed fragments, but eager to hand it on. Hence he writes with a fervour only too rare in historical works, and with a predilection for the personal aspect of history which is very human, and which is, wrongly enough, supposed

to be the antithesis of all that is "scientific" in historical research. He even personifies the nation, and his history may be said to take the form of a biography of France, "the soldier of God."

As we read we are continually conscious of a glow of personal feeling, of the gradual unrolling of a great human panorama, "a fayre field full of folke," like that which Piers Plowman saw as he lay dreaming among the Malvern Hills. It is by no means easy to say with any degree of exactness how the historian produces this effect. But in the earlier portion of his book, at least, it is done by the use of copious extracts from the chronicles and other "sources" which were nothing if not human, even to the verge of gossip. Duruy has, moreover, an eye for the telling sentence which slips readily into the mind, is retained without effort, and illuminates, as with a search-light, some barren tract of historical record. Thus, to quote only one example, he lets in a flood of light upon the Dark Ages when he reports the saying of a certain far-seeing abbot about the devoted work of the copyists:—"Every letter written is a wound inflicted on the devil."

He is equally vivid and personal in his description and summary of character, and seems to be consistently obsessed with the fear that the men and women of whom he is writing may remain mere names written upon sand. His portrait of St. Louis may be taken as a good example: "The true hero of the Middle Ages, a prince as pious as he was brave, who loved feudalism, and who dealt it many wise blows; who reverenced the Church, and who could, when necessary, resist its head; who respected all rights, but above all followed the course of justice; who had a frank and gentle spirit, a loving heart filled with Christian charity, and condemned to torture the body of the sinner in order to save his soul; who living on earth yet gazed ever heavenward, and who rendered his kingly office a magistracy of order and equity. He was canonised by Rome and the people still picture him seated beneath the oak of Vincennes dispensing justice to all comers." There is something arresting and provocative about such a description, and it prepares us for a careful consideration of the king's true place in history by first of all enlisting our sympathy for him as a man.

Sometimes a mere phrase or a sentence, original or quoted, serves the same vivid purpose as when he speaks of Gilbert of Montpensier, Viceroy of Naples, as "a brave knight but one

who never rose before mid-day " ; or sums up the effect of the strong rule of Louis XII. by quoting the saying of a contemporary writer, " No one was so bold as to take anything without paying, and the cocks crowed loudly in the fields without danger." The position and power of the princely houses in the time of Charles VII. is fixed indelibly in our minds by the saying attributed to one of the princes, " He so loved the kingdom of France that in place of one king he would have six " ; while the monarch's own position is no less forcibly summed up in the sentence, " He became the chief revolutionary." Such bright expressions are the lamps of history. Future ages will surely bless the German leaders of 1914 for the phrase " a scrap of paper."

Of course, the adoption of the picturesque method is full of danger. In his eagerness to sustain the personal note, a writer may give an occasional wrong impression which no amount of truthful research will ever be able to wipe out. A chronicler is not necessarily impeccable because he is contemporary, as we know to our cost to-day. The picturesque becomes ridiculous when it descends to such sentences as " The streets ran six inches deep in blood." The bold, animated panorama must not be examined with a microscope. No living man could do original work over so wide a field. It is sufficient if he is able to arouse keen attention ; to fix the main lines of historical development ; to show clearly the " one increasing purpose " ; to correlate and co-ordinate the seemingly aimless efforts and struggles of a restless people so full of ideas that they seem to leave no scope for the exercise of originality on the part of any other nation.

Duruy takes special pains to show how the French nation had its beginnings. Indeed, some of those who are most keenly interested in the life of the present day have said that he overemphasises this part of his story. Such a criticism is surely unjust or, at the best, lacking in thoughtfulness. Duruy had fully grasped one great ruling principle of the modern historian, namely, that it is the function of history to teach us first to know ourselves and then to know our neighbours. We cannot arrange for the future unless we have first studied the circumstances and influences which have formed us in the past. That most curious entity, a modern nation, with all its local varieties and its dominating unity, is the product of long centuries of combination, blending, turmoil, and effort, of sub-conscious movement towards some " far-off divine event," and of inter-

course with other peoples, qualified always by a strange exclusiveness and sense of privacy which we call the national consciousness, though we are ignorant to the fullest degree of what we mean. There is no modern " question " which has not its primary root in these matters. Many mistakes might have been spared a nation which had studied its " Irish question " in an intelligent historical manner. A knowledge of the earlier movements and settlements of the races of middle Europe is the key to the problems which will face us during the next generation in that distracted bloodstained continent.

Moreover, Duruy bases his study of the earlier racial movements and the later settlements upon geography, the only satisfactory foundation for history. He recognises the control of the earth from which we spring, of the seas which still mock our mightiest efforts, as well as of climate, which, in spite of our advance of knowledge, reigns supreme over the human race. He traces the evolution of a distinct and separate people moulded physically and mentally by these external things and gradually developing a national mind which finds expression in folk-lore, poetry, family custom, and central organisation differing from those of the surrounding peoples. That which comes to be called " French " is a composite product of mind and soul, but it is based upon physical things.

Yet there are traits which are common to the several nations, and men of Anglo-Saxon stock whose ancestors fought so stoutly through the ages for the principle of government with the consent of the governed cannot fail to be intensely interested in the particulars given by Duruy concerning the consistent efforts of the people of France to control their own political destiny. In our own insular histories the States-General appears for the first time in the record of the French Revolution, and the assembly is usually introduced as a kind of historic relic which has little more than the shadow of a name. Duruy has a different story to tell, a story which is calculated to correct our false impressions and to show the real significance of the popular power in a nation which was destined to be a standard-bearer in the march of democracy. The French Parliament appears to us to be a very human thing when we read how, on one occasion, a list of grievances three hours' long lulled the king into a profound slumber.

Duruy deals shortly and succinctly with the events of the disaster of 1870-71. He volunteered for war service as soon as the struggle broke out, and was therefore in no favourable

position to get the right perspective of the events which were taking place around him. Knowing this we read his scanty comments and his poignant personal references with a real human interest. The terse sentences are wrung from the lips of a brave and proud man upon whom has fallen a misfortune for which he has no personal responsibility, but for which he is determined not to blame his friends. The Preface to the edition of 1873 is printed at the head of this volume because of its intense human interest at a time when the glories of the Marne and of Verdun are fresh in the minds of men. When we consider all the circumstances we are forced to the conclusion that there is no more arresting sentence in the whole world's history than the following:

> "Who knows but that the broken sword, left in our hands after a sudden misfortune, will not one day be required to defend universal liberty against brutal ambition?"

It is interesting to compare Duruy with Macaulay and Green —to whose "school" he may be said to belong—to drop into the conventional academic jargon which each of the three men abhorred. Duruy is like both Englishmen in his fervour, freshness of mind, breadth of outlook, and impatience of restraint. He is like Green in his desire to write of the French nation, rather than to make his book a mere record of statecraft, and in his method of fusing into one coherent whole historical subjects which had hitherto, according to convention, been treated separately; but he has not Green's power of using literature as a prime factor in the national life, or of making local history the starting-point for that of the nation. Moreover, he shares with Green the credit of having aroused a keener interest in modern history in the world of higher education. He resembles Macaulay in pictorial power and personal appeal, in his effort to show the actual life lived by his ancestors, in his vivid portraiture, and in his steady refusal to sink the man and the patriot in the historian.

But literary comparisons are limited in their usefulness. Duruy has left us the best, if not the only, short history of France available for readers who wish to gain a general conspectus of the nation's record, and to obtain some clear idea of the mind and purpose of the people of France from the time of their establishment as a separate nation to the period of "the broken sword." He gave his countrymen a book which is

animated by a glowing but reasoned patriotism, and its popularity in France is a proof that he had his share in the creation of that indomitable spirit which made possible the victories of the Marne and Verdun.

R. W.

The following is a list of Duruy's works:—

Histoire des Romains et des peuples soumis à leur domination, 2 tom., Paris, 1843-44; Histoire Universelle: Publiée par une Société de professeurs et de savants sous la direction de Victor Duruy, Paris, 1846, etc. (Histoire du Moyen Age, Histoire Grecque, Histoire Romaine, Histoire Sainte d'après la Bible, Histoire des Temps Modernes); A General History of the World . . . thoroughly revised, with an introduction and a summary of contemporaneous history, 1848-1901, by E. A. Grosvenor, London [Norwood, Mass., printed 1905]; Atlashistorique de la France, Paris [1849]; Chronologie de l'Atlas historique [being the text to the foregoing], Paris, 1849; Abrégé de l'histoire de France depuis les lemps les plus reculés jusqu'en 1814, avec une géographie physique et politique de la France actuelle . . . Deuxième édition, Paris, 1851: État du Monde Romain vers le temps de la Fondation de l'Empire, Paris, 1853; Histoire romaine, jusqu'à l'invasion des Barbares . . . Troisième édition, Paris, 1855 (the second edition is contained in the Histoire Universelle): Dix-neuvième édition revue et corrigée, Paris, 1899; History of Rome and of the Roman People, translated by W. J. Clarke, edited by J. P. Mahaffy, illustrated with . . . engravings, etc., 6 vols, London, 1883-86.

Histoire de France de 1453 à 1815: Avec 23 cartes et plans . . . rédigé conformément au programme d'admission à l'École Militaire de Saint-Cyr, Paris, 1856; Histoire populaire de la France, Paris, 1862-63; Petite Histoire de France, Paris, 1863: Histoire de France: Vingt-deuxième édition, publiée avec un nouvel appendice de 1815 à nos jours et illustrée d'un grand nombre de gravures et de cartes, 2 tom., Paris, 1908; A History of France . . . abridged and translated from the seventeenth edition by M. Carey, Boston, Mass. [printed 1905].

Petite Histoire de Moyen Âge, Paris, 1859; Les Papes princes Italiens, Paris, 1860; Histoire de la Grèce ancienne [new edition], 2 tom., Paris, 1862; Histoire des Grecs, 2 tom., Paris, 1874; Nouvelle édition . . . augmentée et enrichie de . . . gravures et de . . . plans, 3 tom., Paris, 1886-89; History of Greece . . . with an introduction by J. P. Mahaffy, with . . . engravings, maps, etc., 4 vols., London, 1892; Causeries de voyage. De Paris à Bucharest. Première partie de Paris à Vienne, Paris, 1864 [no more published]; Histoire populaire contemporaine de la France, 1864-66; Petite Histoire de temps modernes. Avec une carte de l'Europe en 1648, Paris, 1864; Introduction générale à l'Histoire de France, Paris, 1865; Notes et souvenirs, 1811-1894, etc., Paris, 1901.

Lavisse, E. Un Ministre, Victor Duruy, Paris, 1895.

Publishers' Note.—The present translation is entirely new and is the joint work of L. Cecil Jane and Lucy Menzies.

CONTENTS

VOLUME I

PAGE

PREFACE TO THE EDITION OF 1873 1
PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION 2
INTRODUCTION—GEOGRAPHICAL DESCRIPTION OF FRANCE . 15

THE FIRST PERIOD—INDEPENDENT GAUL (1600 B.C.–50 B.C.)

CHAP.
I. PRIMITIVE PEOPLES: MANNERS AND CUSTOMS (1600 B.C.–125 B.C.) 29
II. MIGRATIONS OF THE GAULS (1600 B.C.–125 B.C.) . 39
III. CONQUEST OF GAUL BY THE ROMANS (125 B.C.–50 B.C.) . 48

SECOND PERIOD—GAUL UNDER THE ROMANS (50 B.C.–A.D. 476)

IV. GAUL UNDER THE EMPIRE (50 B.C.–A.D. 395) . . 59
V. INVASION OF THE BARBARIANS: THE FRANKS BEFORE CLOVIS (241–481) 67

THIRD PERIOD—MEROVINGIAN FRANCE (481–687)

VI. CLOVIS (481–511) 74
VII. THE SONS OF CLOVIS (511-561) 85
VIII. THE SONS AND GRANDSONS OF CLOTAIRE I. (561-618) . 95
IX. STATE OF GAUL IN THE SIXTH CENTURY 103
X. CLOTAIRE II. AND DAGOBERT, SOLE KINGS OF THE FRANKS: ANARCHY AFTER THEIR TIME (613-687) . 119

FOURTH PERIOD—CAROLINGIAN FRANCE (687–887)

XI. RECONSTRUCTION OF THE EMPIRE AND OF THE CENTRAL POWER BY THE AUSTRASIAN MAYORS OF THE PALACE (687-752) 126
XII. THE WARS OF PIPPIN THE SHORT AND CHARLEMAGNE (752-814) 133
XIII. GOVERNMENT OF CHARLEMAGNE 142
XIV. DISMEMBERMENT OF CHARLEMAGNE'S EMPIRE OWING TO THE RISING OF THE NATIONS (814-843) 152
XV. DISMEMBERMENT OF THE KINGDOM OF FRANCE BY THE USURPATIONS OF THE LEUDES (843-887) 160

FIFTH PERIOD—FEUDAL FRANCE (887-1180)

CHAP.		PAGE
XVI.	The Last Carolingians and the Dukes of France (887-987)	174
XVII.	The First Four Capetians (987-1108)	179
XVIII.	France in the Eleventh Century: Exposition of the Feudal System	189
XIX.	Foreign Enterprises during the Second Half of the Eleventh Century	211
XX.	The First Crusade (1095-1099)	216
XXI.	Louis VI. the Fat (1108-1137) and the Communes	225
XXII.	Louis VII. the Young (1137-1180)	237

SIXTH PERIOD—FIRST VICTORY OF THE MONARCHY OVER THE FEUDAL ARISTOCRACY (1180–1328)

XXIII.	Philip Augustus and Louis VIII. (1180-1226)	243
XXIV.	St Louis (1226-1270)	254
XXV.	The Civilisation of the Thirteenth Century	264
XXVI.	Philip III. the Bold and Philip IV. the Fair (1270-1314)	278
XXVII.	The Three Sons of Philip the Fair (1314-1328)	291

SEVENTH PERIOD—THE HUNDRED YEARS' WAR—RENEWED ANARCHY (1328-1453)

XXVIII.	Philip VI. Founder of the Line of Capetian-Valois (1328-1350)	295
XXIX.	John the Good (1350-1364)	306
XXX.	Charles V. the Wise (1364-1380)	322
XXXI.	Charles VI. (1380-1422)	337
XXXII.	Charles VII.: To his re-entry into Paris (1422-1436)	357

EIGHTH PERIOD—FINAL VICTORY OF THE MONARCHY OVER THE FEUDAL ARISTOCRACY (1436-1491)

XXXIII.	Expulsion of the English from France and the Government of Charles VII. (1436-1461)	380
XXXIV.	Louis XI. to the Death of his Brother (1461-1472)	400
XXXV.	The Reign of Louis XI. (1472-1482)	419
XXXVI.	The Reign of Charles VIII. (1483-1491)	438

NINTH PERIOD—THE ITALIAN WARS (1494-1515)

XXXVII.	The First Italian War (1494-1498)	450
XXXVIII.	Louis XII. (1498-1515)	456

TENTH PERIOD—FIRST STRUGGLE OF FRANCE WITH THE HOUSE OF AUSTRIA: GROWING POWER OF THE CROWN: THE RENAISSANCE (1515-1559)

XXXIX.	Francis I. (1515-1547)	473
XL.	Henry II. (1547-1559)	498
XLI.	Government of Francis I. and Henry II.	506
XLII.	The Renaissance under Francis I. and Henry II.	515

PREFACE TO THE EDITION OF 1873

At the time when this book first appeared, France enjoyed in herself great prosperity and in the world a place that might well satisfy the most exacting patriotism.

Now the days of misfortune have come; days the sadness of which nothing can relieve and which men of this generation will carry with them all their days—perhaps even to the grave.

But I have altered nothing in these pages, which tell the story of the most illustrious of modern nations; it is impossible for me to conclude this history with the despairing cry, *Finis Galliae*. In spite of passions, of wrong desires, of criminal mistakes, the spirit of order which preserves while reforming prevailed at the last. In spite of international demagogues who would deliver up the fortunes of their country to a coalition of covetous cosmopolitans, I venture to hope that a new France will spring up, ardent in thought and action, to continue the glorious rôle played by the old France in the history of civilisation. The world has still need of this country, whose influence it has so long accepted, to whose attractions it cannot but submit. The world still needs this clear and sympathetic spirit which has given Europe her ideas of right and wrong, which understands how to preserve in utility as well as in frivolity the traditions of art; whose unhappy political experiments have spared others her sad experiences; out of whose mistakes, indeed, the wisdom of nations has been evolved.

Who knows but that the broken sword, left in our hands after a sudden misfortune, may not one day be required to defend universal liberty against brutal ambitions?

France has at least the right to remember that she succeeded three times in arresting or breaking a menacing power, that of Charles V., of Philip II., and of Ferdinand of Austria.

January 1873.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

A GREAT poet of another land once described France as the Soldier of God.

And it does appear that for more than twelve centuries she acted, fought, vanquished, and suffered for the world. By a singular privilege nothing important has happened in Europe in which she has not had a part; no great political or social experiment has been attempted without her; her history recapitulates and sums up the history of modern civilisation. Such was the rôle of Athens in the history of Greece, such, in later days, was the rôle of Rome. For there is always a point where the common life is richer and more intense, a centre on which civilisation seems to concentrate her scattered rays.

Let me sum up in a few words the general trend of the history of France, the part which she has played in the cause of civilisation.

Originally one found only in Gaul—of which Strabo admired the happy nature to the extent of seeing in it a proof of divine providence—a confused mixture of foreign peoples, strangers to each other, Iberians and Gaels, Cimbri and Teutons, Greeks and Italians, dominated by the old Celtic race. And it required the genius of Caesar and his ten legions to conquer and subdue them.

Rome organised the chaos for the first time. To these fighting peoples, who had troubled the ancient world by their vagabond and warlike nature, she brought order and civilisation: she opened up their country with roads, she gave them public buildings and schools. She gave them also laws and government; she bequeathed to them administrative tradition. Gaul was at that time the most prosperous, the most thoroughly Roman, and, therefore, the foremost province of the empire.

But this empire, for which her poets claimed eternity, crumbled to pieces under the accumulated vices of her government. New peoples inundated her provinces, spreading ruin and death. The invasion of Barbarians poured in from every quarter; it succeeded in Gaul alone; the state founded there in time

absorbed all the others. The kingdoms of the Burgundians and the Suevians, the Vandals and the Heruli, the Goths and the Lombards were short-lived. The strongest of them did not survive three centuries, while the successors of Clovis and Charlemagne bequeathed their crown and their title to a house not yet extinct.

Having spread over the whole country, the invasion stopped, recoiled, and disappeared. What if Africa kept the Vandals, Italy the Goths, Spain the Alans and Suevians? France was the headquarters: there the invaders settled down, ceasing indeed to exist for themselves; allowing themselves to be submerged and led by those they had conquered, and above all by the Church. "When you fight," wrote a bishop of Valence to Clovis, "victory is with us."

The bishop spoke truly. The victory over the Franks was the salvation of the Catholic clergy, at that time threatened by more serious danger than they had ever before encountered; Arianism triumphed supreme. The Franks alone were untainted by this heresy, they gave to the Church security and power, conquering all to lay all at her feet. *Mitis, depone colla, Sicamber.*

But an enemy approached which had been up to that time invincible. Islam, starting from Arabia, had spread in three centuries from the Ganges up to the Pyrenees. It would now surmount that barrier. Its urgent forerunners passed the Garonne, crossed the Loire; Christian Europe was threatened. The Franks stopped this advance, and threw back beyond the mountains the Mussulman invasion, which was from this time broken and impotent against western Europe.

The Papacy, newly freed from the supremacy of the Byzantine emperors, was now threatened by that of the Lombard kings. In a time when all questions became religious questions, when society belonged to and hemmed herself in by the Church, when the people showed a docile obedience to the commands emanating from the chair of St. Peter, it was unfortunate that the leader of Christianity ran the risk, in not having political independence, of becoming an instrument of oppression in the hands of a temporal ruler. Pippin and Charlemagne prepared the way for the temporal independence of the Papacy.

The barbarian world fluctuated, vague, undecided, abandoning itself to the many influences with which it came in contact, possessing no common life and consequently no power, no endurance. Charlemagne took it in his powerful hands, fashioned it, organised it, and tried to introduce into this

refractory mass the breath of life. He constituted German and Christian Europe and in taking Rome as his pattern he showed that the foundations of empire must rest on ancient civilisation purified and transformed by Christianity. He set up again, to the misfortune of Italy, the western empire; he created Germany, which had not existed before his time; and he gave to France that European supremacy which the Merovingians had led him to recognise and which she had indeed already exercised.

Charlemagne died; his work fell to pieces, but was not altogether lost. His great figure hovered still, like the genius of order, over these feudal times, entreating the people to leave chaos behind them, to seek union under a leader both glorious and strong. It is impossible to estimate how much the memory of this great emperor helped kings to reconstitute their power and their states.

Under Charlemagne Christian Europe consisted chiefly of the country of the Franks; the old provinces to the north-east of Gaul, from whence the Franks had come, formed the centre of their empire. But their successors allowed this empire to break up. It was divided into kingdoms, the kingdoms in their turn were broken up into fiefs, and France, her boundaries thrown back from the borders of the Rhine behind the Meuse, was nothing but a confusion of small, independent states. Darkness again descended on the world. When it cleared off, a new society had appeared—feudal society, and here modern civilisation begins. Its foundations were laid for the most part in France.

The feudal revolution had its rise in Germany, but it settled in France. It was the feudalism of France that implanted itself in England with William the Conqueror; in southern Italy with Robert Guiscard; in Portugal with Henry of Burgundy; in the Holy Land with Godfrey de Bouillon. These are the great Frenchmen who rearranged the true charter of feudalism, the *Assises de Jerusalem;* who instituted the tournaments, the military orders, chivalry, and heraldry; who together set up the ideals of courage, of purity, of devotion, and of gallantry which have left such lasting traces on modern customs and morals. It was in France that feudalism and chivalry, the aristocracy of society, found their highest expression. It was in France, too, that absolute monarchy came later to its height and later again, democracy, as if the people of France had been entrusted, for the benefit of other nations, with the duty

of experimenting in every form of political constitution down to its uttermost consequences.

Feudalism, so oppressive in its decadence, had its times of greatness too—as when it arrested the second barbarian invasion, that of the Northmen, the Hungarians, and the Saracens—for all power is established by its usefulness and falls by its abuses. Feudalism had also its heroic age, at the time of the crusades, when millions of men came forward to fight for the conquest of a tomb. The crusades were the greatest glory of the Middle Ages, and they belong nearly all to France, like the Truce of God, which they prepared. The East recognised this, for in the East after that time every European was hailed as a Frenchman, and the historian of the crusades gave to his book the title, *Gesta Dei per Francos*.

The Middle Ages are now at the zenith of their glory, and it is in France that their full grandeur is attained. Italy has famous Popes, but a Saint is on the throne of France, "the elder son of the Church." The clergy are all-powerful, but where do we find more striking examples of the lessons in equality and respect for intellect than those the Church gives to feudal society in preserving the system of election, lost elsewhere; in calling the humblest sons of the people to the pontifical chair, making them the equals of the greatest in the land? And where has monasticism with its happy results flourished to a like extent? A French monk, Bernard of Clairvaux, governed Europe. What order can compare with that Order of Citeaux, of which the head was called the Abbot of Abbots; who ruled over 3000 monasteries and raised up again the military orders of Calatrava and Alcantara in Spain; of Abis and Christ in Portugal. A new art, unknown to Greece and Rome, which was neither Teutonic nor Arabic, but to which perhaps the East gave the first inspiration, came to the light of day in those glorious monuments of Gothic architecture, those mighty structures of chiselled stone, at once imposing in their massive grandeur and delicate in their lightness (the cathedrals of Paris, Rouen, Amiens, Chartres, Reims, Bourges, Strassburg, etc.). Paris, "the city of philosophers," is the centre whence a brilliant light shines forth upon the world. Men flock to her schools from the most remote regions, schools which have drawn forth science from the monasteries and secularised it. Great reputations are not made save at her University, which boasts 20,000 students, and where the most illustrious scholars of Germany, Italy, and England were in turn students and professors. Latin

is their common tongue, scholasticism their science. But the language of Villehardouin and Joinville aspires to universality, thanks to the Crusaders who carried it everywhere and to the troubadours and bards who poured forth on Europe a flood of poetry. An Italian who translated into French a chronicle of his own country in 1275 said of the French language, "It is spread over all the world." And Dante's master (Brunetto Latini) used it in writing his *Trésor*, because "the language of France is the most generally known in all nations."

The intellectual domination of Europe is now apparent to us.

Civilisation does not march straight forward; it has times of arrest and recoil which would give rise to despair did we not know that human life is a long journey over a difficult road, on which the traveller rises and descends, while advancing always. Up till the time of St. Louis [1] and the Angelic Doctor,[2] the Middle Ages had ascended to the heights of art and science; after that time they fell rapidly, losing themselves in the shoals of the following century in which there was untold misery and suffering.

The thirteenth century has indeed no achievements to boast of. All that it prized or glorified either fell or was lowered to the depths. The Papacy was made ridiculous at Anagni and held captive at Avignon by that same hand of France which had formerly helped it to raise itself above crowned heads. This schism all but destroyed the Church; the Crusaders and the Knights Templars were sent together to the block; feudalism tottered, secretly undermined. A famous noble, the nephew of a pope, was hanged like a common knave; a common knave, a silversmith, received the honour of knighthood.

What is the power which causes this ruin all around it and which raises itself from the debris it has created? The great revolutionary at this time is the king himself, as the aristocracy had been before, as the people were to be after Louis XVI. The monarchy, which not long before could only boast of the four or five towns of Philip I., had in two centuries broken through the circle of feudal strongholds which surrounded it and now went forward with great strides from power to power towards absolute authority. It had regained one by one the public powers usurped by the nobles. On these insubordinate vassals who dated their charters *Deo regnante*, in the absence of a king, the monarchy imposed the king's peace, the king's justice, the king's money; and so, after an interval of three centuries, it reclaimed the right of making laws for the whole state. The

[1] Louis IX. [2] Thomas Aquinas.

last of these capitularies dates from the time of Charles the Simple, and the first ordinance of general interest is in the reign of Philip Augustus. By the time of the Valois, feudalism had none but administrative and military powers.

This revolution from above had been possible because there was also a revolution from below. Philosophy and Christianity had morally wiped out ancient slavery; the invasions had disorganised it; little by little the slaves became serfs, doing only regular work instead of arbitrary work; living and dying—far from a capricious and violent master—on the soil on which they had been born and on which the agricultural family at last began to establish itself. This new class increased in two ways; the slaves elevated themselves, the colonists and dispossessed freemen descended. By the tenth century the transformation had taken place. Few slaves remained; the rural population as well as the greater part of the urban population consisted solely of serfs.

Then another great movement began. The Bishop Adalébro in a Latin poem addressed to King Robert recognised only two classes, the clergy who prayed and the nobles who fought. Below these, according to him, and very far removed from them, grovelled the serfs and labourers who, though they toiled, were of no account in the state. But these men, even though the bishop took no account of them, frightened him. Another revolution sprang up. "Customs change," it cried; "the social power is tottering." It is the answer in every century of those on whom fortune has smiled to the claims of their less fortunate inferiors. The revolution could not be diverted; it began, and drew the labourers from their servitude up to the level of those who were the masters of the country. But it took over 700 years to accomplish this.

The towns gave the signal. Communal insurrection broke in upon liberty and order. The monarchy favoured the movement outside of its own domains, on the lands of the nobles, and the communal militia seconded the king in his feudal warfare. They followed the *oriflamme* against the castles which Louis VI. wished to destroy and they helped Philip Augustus to win the first national victory of France, that of Bouvines (1214). But the communes aimed at a jealous independence, and in their struggle for the independence of the towns they succeeded no better than the castles in their similar endeavour. The kings opposed them both, for both threatened the formation of national life. But instead of restraining these anarchist liberties by bringing them

back to a liberty compatible with order and unity in the state, the monarchy ruined them altogether and thus prepared the gulf which afterwards widened round itself.

But if the castles and communes lost, the little bourgeois towns and country towns gained. The first of these obtained guarantees for their industry and their commerce, for the safety of their property and the persons of their inhabitants; the second saw the conditions of the rural population improved. In the twelfth century the serfs were advanced to the giving of evidence in courts of justice; in the fourteenth the franchise was extended, for the nobles began to see that they gained by having on their land free labourers rather than serfs "who neglected to work in saying that they worked only for the gain of others"; in the fourteenth century the country districts became organised. Ecclesiastical parishes became civil communities; in the fifteenth at last, the rural population achieved political freedom; they took part in the nomination of deputies to the States-General of 1484. Thus the bourgeoisie, dispossessed of exclusive privileges, and the newly enfranchised serfs met midway between servitude and liberty and gave each other the hand.

All countries have had communes and serfs; France alone made of her humbler population the third order or estate of the Estates of the Realm, an order which was adopted and is still in force all over Europe. A new social order began then and altered the division of our flag.

And so the slaves, who in early times were nothing but instruments for work, *instrumentum vocale*, who were bought and sold along with oxen, horses, and ploughs, *instrumentum mutum*, who in the Middle Ages regained their personality and became men, rose still further in the social scale and became citizens. Enriched by commerce, enlightened by science which they had demanded of the universities, prepared for the management of public affairs by their part in the administration of municipal affairs, they were called by Philip the Fair to take their place in political life. Gradually the leaders found their way into the ministries, into Parliament, into the Council, and ultimately to all judicial and financial offices. From there they domineered over the monarchy, sometimes even over the king, but they also, from fear of feudal power, guided their rulers towards absolute power, which they succeeded in establishing.

At the beginning of the fourteenth century, the disposal of the crown was in the hands of the States-General at their

councils ; they made the king ; in 1357 and 1484 they wanted almost to do away with the monarchy altogether. But feudalism was still too powerful, the strong hand of an individual ruler was still too necessary, and these attempts miscarried. They had not sprung from the general conscience or reflection of the nation, but from the bold thoughts of a few individuals at the sight of the frightful miseries in which France was plunged.

For the monarchy, forgetting to what it owed its existence, had become again foolhardy, feudal ; it had driven the country down to the depths whence it was only rescued after indescribable sufferings. Warned by this cruel lesson the monarchy dismounted from its warhorse, laid aside the battle-axe and lance, which had so ill served Philip V. and King John ; it came down to the level of the bourgeoisie and remembered its plebeian counsellors. The nobles had nothing for them but disdain, insults, sometimes even exile or the gibbet, though they did not scorn to appropriate the property of those they so wrongfully ill-treated. But the people were not to be discouraged ; they always rose again to shelter the rulers who had need of their intelligence and who had nothing to fear from their weakness : they reappeared carrying with them their political gospel, the Roman law, urging their common rights, which rested on equality, as opposed to feudal rights, which were founded on privilege. They banished a Count of Armagnac, condemned a Duke of Alençon to death, burned a Marshal de Retz, and threw a bastard of the house of Bourbon into the river tied in a sack, on which was written, " Let the justice of the king be carried out."

Whence did the people get this confidence, this forcefulness ? They had made the king supreme judge of the peace of the country and they had given him three things which together comprised all the rest: public opinion, money, and an army. The Middle Ages knew neither a standing army nor a tax in perpetuity to maintain it. The king lived in his own domain, and had no soldiers except those his nobles chose to send him at a special time and for a special purpose. The advisers of Charles VII., taking a wide view back over ten centuries, adopted from the Roman Empire the double system of standing armies and taxation. This system was created at Rome at the same time as absolute power, which it strengthened and consolidated. It had in France the same result. Louis XI. completed the downfall of feudal aristocracy : Charles VII. and Francis I. led their people away on long expeditions, and when they had

them safely in military camps accustomed them to military discipline. By the sixteenth century the feudalism of France embraced only the nobility.

By means of religious wars and wars of minorities, feudalism attempted to regain its lost power. But Richelieu caused the heads of its leaders to roll on the scaffold and razed to the ground its last strongholds; feudalism fell, broken in pieces, ruined in the anterooms of Louis XIV., who had indeed decorated it with titles and ribbons, but had also chained it to the triumphal chariot of the monarchy.

While dealing with this internal revolution, France was also active outside her own boundaries. Charles VIII. by his expedition into Italy had begun the great wars which, by mixing up the peoples, their interests, and ideas, established from a political point of view the solidarity of European nations, the idea of balance of power: France had twice attempted this task in the Middle Ages, at the time of the crusades from a religious point of view and at the time of Charlemagne in a first grand sketch of social organisation. Both in the sixteenth and in the seventeenth centuries she defended the liberties of Europe against the house of Austria. Under Louis XIV. Austria threatened but was frightened off by the blinding splendour of the civilisation of France, which was reflected even to the most remote regions.

At this period of unhoped-for greatness, French society took a new form. The successor of Hugh Capet ruled over twenty million men and signed his ordinances with the formula, "This is my pleasure." Like the Roman emperors, he was the personification of the law, *lex animata*. He rose higher even than the Empire, to a position similar to those oriental monarchies in which political and religious despotism, in order to be more certain of the blind obedience of the people, attributed to their ruler the powers of a divine being. The king called himself the Vicar of God on earth; he proclaimed his divine right; he set himself apart from humanity. The neighbouring peoples accepted this new theory which France formulated and practised. The divine right of kings was universally accepted, and Europe, with strange docility, modelled all her royal courts on that of Versailles. Louis XIV. was assuredly not a great man, but he was a great king, the greatest Europe has seen.

Always through the history of the world, when an important movement has appeared and persisted, it has been because it was needed; because it was the result of necessary causes and

so justified its existence. But there is nothing immortal in this world. The people—communities of free and active beings—have always new needs : stagnation would be their death. Born of general needs and constraints, a constitution, in order to satisfy them, must give way to the changes which come to pass in ideas and customs, like a supple and elastic covering which yields and extends round the germ which it protects, following its growth. To impose peace and order on a multitude of contrary wills and contrasting passions, to group together adverse elements, one great power was needed to subordinate all others ; it was necessary that local centres of independent life should be extinguished, that the spirit of France should be centred in one man before she could feel the national life pulsing within her. It was necessary, in short, that Louis XIV. should be able to say, "L'État c'est moi," before Siéyès could reply, "L'État c'est nous."

While the monarchy "by divine right" was in the ascendency, a great and confused movement was going on among the lower classes. The Middle Ages, with all their anarchy and violence, had great and strong views of public right ; no tax could be levied without the assent of those whom it would affect ; no law could be passed if it was not accepted by those who would have to obey it ; no sentence was lawful which was not passed by the equals of the accused. These principles, and many others, met with constant opposition, were stifled and reappeared again. There is always some voice raised against them : it is the Sieur de Pecquigny in 1357 ; the Sieur de la Roche in 1484 ; and many others in the states of Orleans and Pontoise ; they are debated in the two assemblies of Blois, above all in that of 1614, of which the records show nearly all the later demands of 1789. And so the traditions of public guarantees and national rights were not lost. Each generation transmitted them to the following generation, and they came thus, increasing with the march of the centuries, to the time when they became part of the national life, when the interests of the many eclipsed the interests of the individual.

The kings heard this independent voice from the deputies of the country with displeasure, and in order to silence it, they ceased from 1614 to unite the deputies. "It is not good," said Louis XIV., "that one should speak in the name of all." But the voice continued to make itself heard, even at the foot of the throne ; feeble and timid in itself, it was powerful by the echoes it evoked. Parliament, "the court of the king," tried

to emerge from the obscurity of its judicial function, to raise itself to the position of a political power. It called itself the "protector born of the people," and as before Louis XIV. it had kept silence, after him it became emboldened to the extent of troubling all the eighteenth century by its quarrels with the court.

Parliament itself had been impotent. Though this aristocracy of functionaries could speak for the people, it could not make them act. But national education had been established. By the work of their hands and by their intelligence, the third order had grown with each generation in wealth and knowledge. In the Middle Ages there was only one form of wealth, the land, and the nobility held that; but free labour created another form of wealth, capital, and that was in the hands of the bourgeoisie. Following close on the heels of prosperity came the desire for knowledge: the minds of the people became enlightened. France had not had Luther and his religious reform, which had left her behind, but she had Descartes, whose philosophical reform urged her forward. She had remained Catholic without the Inquisition, and a renaissance nearly as brilliant as that of Italy had opened up to her the paths of art, science, and truth. These great gifts produced in intelligent minds an awakening which, in conjunction with her men of genius, led France to the greatest age of her literature and for the second time to the intellectual domination of Europe.

Louis XIV. arriving suddenly in the midst of this galaxy of French genius, brought into it order and discipline. But the respect he showed for those who possessed nothing but the gifts of intelligence told against his political system. Corneille, in the palace of Richelieu, was little more than a servant paid to write verses: Racine, Boileau, and Molière might almost be described as the intimates of the great king. Louis XIV., who enjoyed absolute power, was obliged to encourage industry and literature, two forces which were destined to overthrow what he had built up: for the one gave to the working classes the wealth which led it to demand guarantees, and the other that enlightenment which led it to demand its rights.

In the seventeenth century, literature was included in the domain of art, but opposition from the sphere of religious beliefs did not cease. The opponents were the Protestants and the Jansenists; the great pamphlet of that time was written against the Jesuits. In the eighteenth century, absolute power being compromised by the material interests, which multiplied

every day, of commerce and industry, the opposition passed to the realm of politics, and literature, the expression of the new need, took command and seemed to rule supreme. The most virile forces of the French spirit gave themselves to working for the public good. No one tried to write beautiful verse, but rather to formulate useful maxims. The whims and caprices of society were no longer regarded with amusement, but studied in order to improve society. Literature became a weapon which every one, the unskilled as well as the skilled, sought to wield, and which, striking out on every side, worked great and irremediable havoc. By a strange inconsequence, those who had most to fear from this movement, men of letters engaged in political life, were those who applauded it most loudly. But this society of the eighteenth century, in spite of its frivolity and sensuality, egoistical as it was, had yet among its vices the breath of the spirit. Never were the *salons* more animated, never were manners more exquisite, never was conversation more brilliant. Talent took the place of birth, and the nobility, with a chivalrous temerity which recalls that of Fontenoy, endured the fire of the ardent polemic directed against them by the bourgeoisie with a smile on their lips.

Then a tremendous inquiry began. Some one found out and proclaimed the vices of the social organisation; the veil was lifted from the terrible sores which were enervating the country, which were exhausting her, which would kill her were a remedy not found. Others took no account of the ancient structure in which society had sheltered herself so long: in thought they razed it to the ground, to reconstruct on the levelled soil a new society. This strong voice of France was heard beyond her own frontiers; governments woke up; kings and ministers set to work; canals were dug, roads made, industry, commerce, and agriculture encouraged. Justice and beneficence were on every tongue. But France, who had sounded the alarm, showed the danger, and led the rulers of other lands to attack the evil by material reforms, could obtain nothing for herself. Necker and Turgot were sent away as dangerous utopians; Calonne fell the very day he pronounced sentence of reform on existing abuses: the regime would yield nothing—it lost all. The revolution carried everything before it; it proclaimed ideas which are to-day the foundations of our public and private law, and which the republic and the empire scattered all over Europe with our victories. These ideas spread because they can be described in one single word, justice.

It has often been said of the literary genius of France, that its distinguishing feature is its good sense, its reason. I would add also, from a certain point of view, its impersonality. For Rabelais and Montaigne, Descartes and Molière, Pascal, Voltaire, and Montesquieu write for the world as much as for their own country. The aim they pursue is truth; their personal enemy falsehood; and the immortal types they portray belong much more to humanity in general than to France alone. In this sense our literature, like our art, is of all literatures the most human because it is the least exclusively national.

That also is the distinctive characteristic of the political spirit and of the history of France. Nothing exaggerated can endure. Feudalism stopped and recoiled before it had made of France another Germany; the communes were transformed before they made France another Italy: so that France had neither feudal anarchy, from which the one has so lately freed herself, nor municipal anarchy, which has so long delivered the other over to the hands of foreigners. Absolute monarchy, necessary perhaps for levelling the ground, has not been able to perpetuate itself in its divine right, as it had expected: neither has radicalism been able to perpetuate what it was bold enough to call its revolutionary right.

It is this oscillating but continuous progress that constitutes the charm of French history, because one sees in it the progress of humanity. It is not that France has led the world, but that she has often been found in the advanced guard: she has held the flag by which others have often been guided. They followed at a distance, trying to resist and shake off her compelling influence: they talked loudly of her faults and her caprices; they recalled their own most patriotic memories and exalted their own national glories. But the first language they learnt after that of their own land was that of France; the first glance they gave outside of their own frontiers was directed towards France.

After the Battle of Salamis, the Greek generals met together to adjudge the prize of valour. Each one claimed the first for himself, while all were unanimous in according the second to Themistocles.

INTRODUCTION

GEOGRAPHICAL DESCRIPTION OF FRANCE

Boundaries.—Two seas, the Atlantic and the Mediterranean, two ranges of lofty mountains, the Pyrenees and the Alps, and one of the largest rivers of Europe, the Rhine, formed the boundaries of ancient Gaul, which was more than one-fourth again as large as modern France. Not until the treaty of Verdun, in 843, did France withdraw from the Rhine and Alps behind the Meuse and Rhône, and since she recovered her national identity she has persistently sought to recover also her ancient heritage. The frontier of the Alps has been regained; that of the Jura has been accepted and the Swiss thereby permitted to hold part of her natural territory. More recently, she has once more advanced to the Rhine.[1] But from Dunkirk to Lauterbourg her frontier is exposed. Through this gate all her invaders have entered, and it was this gap which Louis XIV. attempted to close by erecting three lines of fortresses; which the Revolution and Bonaparte sought to fortify by disseminating in the adjoining districts her ideas and laws, as an advance guard.

General Aspect.—The wide territory of the ancient Gaul is clearly defined by nature. It constitutes an inclined plane from the summit of the Alps to the Atlantic, the higher part of which, from the Var to the St. Gothard, is comprised within two and a half degrees of latitude. The country widens as it descends towards the ocean, until from the mouth of the Rhine to that of the Adour it extends over nine degrees.

The general formation of the French Pyrenees is similar to that of the Alps. The mountains, which fall sharply into Spain, slope gently towards France, their foot-hills spreading out in a north-westerly direction towards the Atlantic.

Two distinct regions are thus formed. The south and south-east is a land of mountains, of forests and pastures, of lakes and swift rivers; it is peopled by a race, sober and industrious, little given to manufactures, essentially martial. The west and north is a land of gently undulating hills, of fertile valleys and wooded plains, of navigable rivers, of marshes and of moors, of

[1] This was written in 1866.

manufacturing cities and ports. But the mountainous east is pierced by two broad and deep valleys, the great basins of the Rhine and Rhône, and the last spurs of the mountains extend far towards the west. Hence Auvergne, in the heart of France, has its shepherds and goatherds no less than have the Alps; in the valleys of the Rhône and Rhine, as in those of the Seine, Loire, and Garonne, manufacturing and industrial centres are to be found.

This parallelism is of the greatest moment; to it the national unity of France must be attributed. Had the east been peopled only by mountaineers, the west only by sailors, there would have arisen in the country two nations, possibly rendered alien to each other for all time by their divergence of manners and interests, as for long centuries England and Scotland were divided.

Mountains of France.—The characteristic feature of France is the long chain of the Cevennes and the Vosges. This mountain system, which cuts France in two, forms between its base and those of the Alps, Jura, and Black Forest, that vast hollow into which fall the Rhine and the Rhône; its spurs, which determine the relief of northern and western France, mark out the many extensive valleys opening out upon the three seas. Wholly included within French territory, the Cevennes and the Vosges are the backbone of the country. Yet, while they determine the various water-partings, their elevation is in places slight enough to permit the passage over them of roads and canals.

The Cevennes, properly so-called, are entirely included in the department of Lozère, but their offshoots and their name extend, on the one side, as far as Castelnaudary, where they meet the last hills of the Pyrenees, the Corbières, and on the other side as far as Châlons where they join the heights of the Côte d'Or. Low hills, the plateau of Langres and the Faucilles, to the south of Épinal (491 metres), unite the Cevennes with the Vosges, the highest points of which are the rounded peak of Guebwiller (1431 metres) and Haut d'Honec (1431 metres). The principal peaks in the Cevennes are Mont Mézenc in the Vivarais (1774 metres) and Mont Lozère (1490 metres). The culminating point of the Côte d'Or, Tasselot, near Dijon, only attains a height of 602 metres; the peak of Montaigu, in the plateau of Langres, only 497, and the mountains of the Mâconnais scarcely 160 metres. Taken together, the Cevennes and the Vosges form a chain 960 kilometres in length, which is often narrow, but which in the district of Limoges reaches a breadth of 280 kilometres.

The Cevennes, which have their escarpment on the east, only throw out short spurs on this side, falling abruptly into the great trench formed by the courses of the Rhine, Saône, and Rhône. Westwards, however, they throw out from Lozère the mountains of Velay and Forez, dividing the Loire from the Allier, and the mountains of Margeride (1200 metres) which join the mountains of Auvergne where the Puy de Dôme, the Plomb de Cantal, and the Puy de Sancy rise to a height of 1476, 1858, and 1897 metres respectively. All those ranges which cover the district between the Garonne and the Loire start from the tableland formed by these mountains; its undulating surface resembles a sea frozen in the midst of a tempest. On it are the isolated heights of Haut Quercy, Périgord, and Limousin, and its last spurs sink down into the plain of Poitou in the plateau of Gatine (136 metres). In Auvergne, the craters of three hundred extinct volcanoes have been discovered; the mountain sides are still covered with lava, and the presence of hot-water springs indicates the nearness of subterranean fires. Vesuvius was for thousands of years extinct; science cannot assert dogmatically that the volcanoes of Auvergne will not once more become active.

The harsh and barren slopes of Morvan and the Nivernais are united with the mountains of Burgundy, dividing the Seine from the Loire. Behind Orleans, these hills spread out into a wide plateau, further west they throw out a short range which may be regarded as beginning at Alençon (273 metres). Between the Mayenne and the Vire this range divides, and its two chains form the skeleton of the peninsulas of Cotentin and Brittany, which thrust themselves boldly into the sea. At the extremity of each a great naval port is situated; one, Cherbourg, is protected by its breakwater, a granite mountain hurled into the sea; while the large roadstead of the other, Brest, can be entered from the Atlantic only by one narrow passage.

The Argonne (439 metres) and the Ardennes (601 metres), between which flows the Meuse, start from the plateau of Langres and the Faucilles. The Ardennes even cross the river, or rather they part to give it passage. Between the sources of the Somme, the Scheldt, and the Sambre, they form a knot from which the hills of Picardy and the Pays de Caux begin, and extend as far as Cap de la Hève and Cap Antifer by Le Havre. From this same knot begin also the ranges of Artois and the Boulonnais, which fall into the Channel at Cap Gris-Nez, Cap Blanc-Nez, and

the hills of Belgium, which, though of slight elevation, are often steep. The eastern Ardennes form a waste and marshy plateau (698 metres) and join the volcanic hills of the Eiffel (866 metres), of which the last spurs, clothed with vineyards and crowned with old feudal strongholds, form between Cologne and Coblentz the most picturesque portion of the Rhine valley.

The Vosges also fall into the plain on the banks of the great river between Spires and Mayence, at the hills of Hardt (674 metres) and Mont Tonnerre (678 metres). At the source of the Lauter, they throw off a branch, the Hundsrück (821 metres), by which the Nahe is turned aside and the Moselle forced back to the foot of the Eiffel. Closely confined by the Moselle and the Rhine, which flow parallel to them, the Vosges have few foothills, their breadth, sixty kilometres between Colmar and Luxeuil, narrowing to twenty-eight between Phalsbourg and Saverne. In the district of Alsace, their spurs are still covered with picturesque feudal ruins, and the traveller who passes through this fair province constantly finds himself in contact with two distinct ages of the world's history. In the plain there are busy manufactories; in the mountains, dismantled walls and roofless towers of old castles, affording a desolate picture of the days when war was man's chief industry.

Rivers of France.—All the valleys which have their source in the Cevennes and the Vosges are interior, since they begin in mountains which must be regarded as the geographical centre of France. All those which begin from a point without the circumference, beyond the frontiers of France, are exterior. This distinction is not less important historically than it is geographically. The first type of valley has been the cradle of the French nation and of French genius; through the second type foreign influences have found their way.

The eastern slopes of the Cevennes contain only the sources of such small rivers as the Hérault, the Gard, and the Ardèche. The Saône descends from the Faucilles and the Ill from the Vosges. The great rivers which have their sources in the heart of the country flow westwards and northwards, the Moselle uniting France with the lower Rhine, the Meuse affording a passage to the North Sea, the Scheldt whose wide and deep estuary forms at Antwerp the best port in northern Europe, the Somme which forms a tidal harbour of no maritime importance, and lastly the Seine and the Loire, the two chief rivers of France, the banks of which have witnessed the birth and growth of French nation-

ality, from which that nationality has won its way step by step to the Pyrenees, the Alps, and the Rhine.

The Loire, which is liable to sudden floods and which is filled with shifting sands, is the more terrible of the two rivers. Its source is situated on a lofty mountain of the Vivarais, 1400 metres above sea-level. The river has been vainly embanked with great dykes, dating possibly from Carolingian times, and heightened or extended by each successive generation. In 1846 it once more broke its banks, after a violent storm had raged in the mountains around its upper reaches, and in a few hours the flood had swallowed up forty-five millions of capital. To the Loire, the Allier brings those streams of Auvergne which do not feed the Garonne; the Cher brings the waters of Berry, the Vienne those of Limousin and Poitou which do not flow into the Charente, and the Mayenne brings the streams of Maine, Anjou, and Perche. At Nantes, the river has received all its tributaries, but despite the great volume of its water, it is filled, even below that city, with sandbanks which compel large ships to discharge their cargoes at Paimboeuf. The Loiret is nothing but the result of the infiltration of the Loire; it forms a kind of gulf, eight kilometres from Orleans and twelve kilometres in length. It flows at the rate of 42 cubic metres a minute, and is navigable to its source. Its floods correspond to those of the Loire, following at an interval of one or two days.

The Seine rises in the Côte d'Or and has for its tributaries the rivers of Orleans, western Burgundy, Champagne, Picardy, and Normandy. Above Montereau, it only receives the Aube; below Pontoise, only the Eure. Its chief tributaries enter between these two towns, the Yonne, the Marne, and the Oise, the last-named contributing also the waters of the Aisne. It was between these two towns, below the Marne which flows in from the east and above the Oise which flows in from the north, in the very centre of the river basin, that Paris arose.

The Emperor Julian in the fifth century praised the placid beauties of the Seine. But as the hills and plains have been denuded of trees, as the soil has been levelled by cultivation and the bed of the river raised, inundations have become frequent. It was once said that in summer and winter its level remained constant; to-day its height in flood is sometimes seven, eight, or even nine metres above summer level. Great works undertaken at Quilleboeuf and on the lower Seine have removed its shifting sands, regulated its course, and deepened its bed. "If ports are unable to receive vessels, vessels must be built

to fit the ports," said Richelieu some two hundred years ago. The impossibilities of the time of the great cardinal have become the possibilities of to-day ; large vessels from London and Bordeaux are already able to discharge their cargoes on the quays of the Louvre.

The valleys of the Garonne, the Rhône, and the Rhine are exterior, for these three rivers have their source beyond the frontiers of France. They were also the last to become politically incorporated with the French realm, the first in 1271 and 1453, the second in 1481, the third in 1648. In 1789 they all still retained their privileges and distinct organisation, but the two first had already long united their life with that of France, the energy of which, during the Middle Ages, was mainly directed from the north to the south. Henry IV. and Richelieu turned the attention of their countrymen to the Rhine.

If these recently acquired provinces have contributed in small measure to the formation of French nationality, they have yet completed it, since their acquisition brought the country to its natural limits. And all the activity of France, for centuries confined to the central regions, has been extended towards these outlying districts, which are to-day more animated and brilliant than the old provinces ever were. Poitiers, Bourges, Sens, Provins, Tours, Blois, Chartres are impoverished and dead in comparison with Bordeaux, Marseilles, Mulhouse, and Strassburg.

The valley of the Garonne, from the sources of the Neste to those of the Vézère, extends over 300 kilometres. Its southern wall is formed by the Pyrenees, which send down into it the rivers which fall from among their heights, the Ariége, Salat, Neste, Gers, and Baïse. Its northern wall is formed by the mountains of Auvergne and is twice as long. And on this side the river receives from the Agout, Tarn, Aveyron, Lot, Dordogne, Vézère, Isle, and Dronne a mass of water so considerable that at Bordeaux it attains a width of from seven to eight hundred metres, at Blaye it is a gulf, and at Royan a sea.

The Pyrenean isthmus, between the gulf of Lyons and that of Gascony, measures 320 kilometres from Bayonne to Perpignan, and 400 from the tower of Cordouan to Narbonne. In this last direction, it is traversed through two-thirds of its extent by the Garonne, one of the finest of French rivers. Nature has here afforded an admirable route for navigation. From Toulouse, where the Garonne turns towards the Atlantic, to the Aude which falls into the Mediterranean, the distance is only 80

kilometres. The Corbières lie there, but fortunately only their last low hills ; at the Col de Narouze their height is only 189 metres, and as Toulouse is 146 metres above sea-level, it is only necessary to ascend 43 metres from that city to reach the summit and begin the descent to the Mediterranean.

Even without reference to history, it could be boldly asserted that for twenty centuries men, goods, and ideas have passed along this route. Here, according to Strabo, was one of the great commercial routes of the Gauls. The Romans and after them the Visigoths followed this path to the conquest of Toulouse, Bordeaux, and Poitiers, thus avoiding the mountains of Auvergne. The Franks traversed the same route in the opposite direction to reach Narbonne. Riquet has there left a deathless memorial of his name, the canal du Midi, better called the canal des Deux-Mers.

This magnificent valley should have its two great towns, one maritime, the other agricultural and industrial, since this is the characteristic of all French rivers. The Rhône has Lyons and Marseilles ; the Loire, Orleans and Nantes; the Seine, Paris and Rouen. Le Havre is of recent growth. This curious parallelism is explained in each case by the same causes. Life, abounding in these rich basins, naturally concentrates itself at two points to answer to the double interest which the river serves, the exploitation of the sea and that of the land. On the Garonne, the two towns are called Bordeaux and Toulouse. The former, which, from its moors, can turn only to the sea, has never in itself possessed a continental influence. The latter, which rivals Paris in its position at the entrance of many valleys and in the centre of a fertile river basin, has had a brilliant history and still claims the title of Queen of the South.

The valley of the Rhône is longer but also narrower. The river rises in the Furca glacier. In the Valais its basin, like the Valais itself, has often no more than a league's breadth, and at St. Maurice, where the river forces its way between precipitous walls formed by two mountains 8000 or 9000 feet in height, its width is reduced to some yards. Lower in its course, the Rhône has hollowed out for itself a vast abyss filled by its waters, the lake of Geneva, the fairest of the European lakes. In this extended space the valley widens, and if the harsh mountains of Savoy are bathed by the waters of the lake, 400 metres deep, on the other shore rich plains spread out, the beautiful hills of the Pays de Vaud. Three leagues from Geneva, however, at fort l'Écluse, the Rhône, as at St. Maurice, pours through a terrible

gorge, its depth here, at the time of the melting of the snows, being from 60 to 70 feet. Near Bellegarde, the river vanishes for a distance of sixty paces, for its lower waters have hollowed out a subterranean passage through the midst of a soft stratum covered by some harder rock.

It is not until it has passed the point of the Jura that its basin extends from the Alps to the Cevennes. But the space is still too restricted for it to assume the tranquil character of the rivers of the plain. The lofty mountains which surround it send to it only torrential streams, and the character of the Rhône itself is always doubtful and terrible. From Lyons to the sea it flows with the swiftness of an arrow ; in fifteen hours it reaches Beaucaire. Dykes have been vainly erected on its banks ; the river breaks them and spreads desolation far and wide. When a south wind blows upon the lofty peaks and in a few hours melts the winter snows, or when heavy rains fall upon the treeless Alps, their barren sides pour down a thousand torrents bearing with them sand and rocks and filling their ancient beds. These seek new courses and fill first the rivers and then the parent stream with their troubled and impetuous waters. The Rhône also bears along its course the ooze it receives and thus strews its course with numerous sandbanks ; finally, in the time of its great floods it hurls into the Mediterranean in 24 hours more than five million cubic metres of solid matter. The vast delta, formed by nature in the first ages of the world, is thus constantly increased, so that the space from Arles to the sea is nothing but a great gulf. A delta of sand and rounded pebbles, the Camargue, 74,000 hectares [1] in extent, has forced the river to divide into many arms, which, like those of the Nile, are constantly changing their situation and number. Two alone remain, of which only one is navigable ; even this is closed by a bar which, in the middle of the year, extends 42 metres towards the south and the top of which is often only some decimetres below the surface of the water. This bar has gaps here and there which change constantly under the influence of heavy winds or of floods, the result being that ships often wait for weeks at the tower of St. Nicholas for a favourable opportunity of passing the bar. One day in four the passage is impossible. Thus the great port of the Rhône valley is not situated on the river itself, but at a distance of 50 kilometres eastwards, at Marseilles, and Arles sank into insignificance before the coming of the railway. Between these two towns is a small inland sea, the lake of

[1] A hectare is a French measure containing a hundred ares.

Berre, which affords an excellent port opening on the Mediterranean through a very deep channel.

The Rhône receives only insignificant streams from the Cevennes. But the Alps send into it the Durance and the Isère. Shut in at its source between high mountains, the Durance, despite the fact that it attains a length of 320 kilometres, is nothing but a capricious and devastating torrent. The rocks and sands which fill its course, the swiftness of its current, its sudden changes, render it unsuitable for navigation. Formerly it fell into the Rhône below Arles, across the plain of Crau, the surface of which, 40,000 hectares in extent, consists of rounded stones which the river has borne down from the Alps. There could be no more desolate view than that of the wide river bed, without definite bounds, strewn with huge rocks and arid sands or cut up into innumerable islands. But under the warm sun of the south, where water is the first need of agriculture and increases productivity tenfold, the rivers are alternately beneficent and terrible. All the old Gallic towns which were not on the sea or on the Rhône were built in the basin of the Durance—Briançon, Embrun, Gap, Sistéron, Digne, Senez, Forcalquier. The cities of Aix, Draguignan, and Grasse were founded by the Romans ; Arles and Marseilles are of Greek origin. The Isère flows past Grenoble ; it receives the Drac, a furious torrent, and the Arc, which comes down from Mont Cenis. Its floods, less frequent than those of the Durance, have sometimes been even more terrible. The Drôme, which flows past Die, falls directly into the Rhône. The Sorgues has its source in the fountain of Vaucluse, the depth of which is unfathomable.

If it possessed no other tributaries, the Rhône could be an excellent military line of defence behind the Alps ; it would not be a river of great commercial or political importance. But by the Saône its valley is opened up towards Burgundy and Champagne ; by it the produce and ideas of old France enter the provinces which it traverses. Despite its sluggish course, in a bed ill-defined, the Saône is thus one of the great arteries of the country and serves as a link between the south-east and the north. Lyons, the largest town of France after Paris, is situated on its banks, where it joins the Rhône.

The Rhine and the Rhône have similar courses. Rising on opposite sides of the St. Gothard, they rapidly part from one another, the first flowing in a northerly, the second in a westerly direction. Near Bregenz, the Rhine meets the Suabian Alps, which cause it to fall into the lake of Constance, as the Alps

of Savoy cause the Rhône to fall into the lake of Geneva. Checked by the Jura, one river flows round either extremity of that range, only to meet the Cevennes and the Vosges which compel them to turn finally the one towards the Mediterranean, the other towards the North Sea.

Less torrential, less rapid than the Rhône, the Rhine pursues a more winding course. Between the St. Gothard and Basle, it receives the waters of the Aar, which increase its volume two-fold by bearing to it all the streams of Switzerland. It is already navigable over a great part of its length, being free from falls and rapids from Schaffhausen to Laufen. From Basle to near Mainz, its course is filled with numerous islands, which on many occasions have assisted armies in crossing the river. But lower down, the beauty of the views, the number of towns which are bathed by its waters, the rich cultivation side by side with arid and desolate rocks, the feudal ruins which cover all the peaks of the Hundsrück, the Eiffel, and the Westerwald, and finally the nature of the river, now wild and terrible, now gracious and majestic, make this valley one of the most beautiful in Europe.

Below Cologne, the Rhine rolls gently towards Düsseldorf and Holland, its volume increased by the Ill, which falls into it at Strasburg, by the Necker at Mannheim, the Main at Mainz, the Moselle at Coblentz, and by other tributaries. Yet, despite the considerable volume of its waters, like the Rhône, it enters the sea humbly. Like the Rhône, it divides into several arms—the Wahal and Lech, which unite with the Meuse, and the Yssel and Vecht, which fall into the Zuyder Zee. Impoverished by all these losses, the true Rhine, or at least the arm which bears that name, possesses at Leyden, after a course of 1200 kilometres, only the breadth of a wide ditch, and almost vanishes in the sands before reaching the sea. Fortunately the Wahal and the Lech unite it with the wide estuary of the Meuse, and thus lay it open to the navigation of large vessels.

Communications of France.—The Cevennes and the Vosges are not sufficiently lofty to interrupt communications. In the south they permit the passage of the canal des Deux-Mers ; in the centre, that of Charolais and Burgundy ; in the north, that of the Marne and the Rhine. The offshoots of these mountains, which cover France, have presented still fewer obstacles. The Seine has been united to the Loire by the canals of Orleans, Briare, and Nivernais ; to the Scheldt by those of St. Quentin and the Somme ; to the Meuse by those of the Sambre and

Ardennes; to the Saône and Rhône by the canal of Burgundy; and to the Rhine by the canal from Vitry to Strasburg. The basin of the Loire has been united with that of the Rhone by the canal of the Centre; the Rhône with the Rhine by the canal of the East; and with the Garonne by the canals of Beaucaire and the Midi. It would not be a very difficult matter to unite the Meuse and Marne with the Saône, and if the Garonne and Loire still remain isolated in respect of each other, the sea yet forms a canal from Nantes to Bordeaux.

Great Lines of Depression and of the Population of France.—France is oriented in regard to the equator and the meridians. Its frontier from Bayonne to Antibes runs in the direction of the parallels of latitude, and while it throws out Brittany, the position of which is exterior, its northern frontier between Cap Barfleur and Cap Gris-Nez is also parallel to the equator. Its chief seaboards on the west are the littoral of the gulf of Gascony and the Cotentin, which would unite if the waves behind St. Malo rose only one hundred metres; on the east the line of the Alps, the Jura, and the Rhine almost exactly follow two meridians. Thus, if on a map of France a square were drawn, having for its four points Caen, Bordeaux, Marseilles, and Dunkirk, and as diagonals two lines drawn from Marseilles to Le Havre and from Bordeaux to Strasburg, the great lines of depression of French territory would also have been traced, and the lines which are followed by the great trade routes, roads, railways, and canals, existing or projected.

From Bordeaux to Marseilles, and from Marseilles to Dunkirk and Rouen, the water communication is very nearly complete; eastwards it is entirely complete from Le Havre to Strasburg, and could be easily completed from Caen to Bordeaux. To unite in this way Bordeaux and Strasburg, it would only be necessary to remove the obstacles which divide the Dordogne from the Allier, since the Loire already communicates with the Saône and the Saône with the Rhine.

These points require closer consideration, despite their apparent materialism, since in them lies the explanation of some of the facts of history. These gaps in the mountains, these depressions of the soil, afford in actual fact the only natural roads which men have so long pursued. By these routes have passed war, commerce, ideas, in a word all the life of the nations which, to assist their eternal quest, have strewn in their path populous cities. Thus, according to the Breton legends, the fairies of Morbihan gently wandered from the heights of their mountains

and on their level surface were able to escape the vast rocks which the astonished traveller meets along the roads. At the entrances, at the ends, in the centres, of these natural roads, and mainly on the banks of rivers, described by Pascal as "the roads which travel ever solitary," great cities are situated, to serve as resting places for merchants and for armies, to serve also as beacon lights of the civilisation which through them has illumined the surrounding land.

The great lines of physical depression have thus been also the great lines of communication and of population; it may be added that the stream of French unity and nationality still flows along them. In the days of Rome, it was along them that the influence of the south spread over the north; along them that in the days of the sons of Clovis and of Pippin d'Heristal, under Philip Augustus and Saint Louis, under Louis XI. and Richelieu, the influence of the north spread to effect the absorption of the south. Had high mountains existed between each of our rivers, France would have been as Spain or Italy; it may be asserted that the inhabitants of each river basin would for long centuries have formed distinct nationalities.

Population spreads rapidly in rich valleys such as those of France, and the remark of Napoleon that Paris and Le Havre are but one city of which the Seine is the chief street might be applied equally to the Loire, the Garonne, the Saône, and the Rhône. But in river basins which are shut away completely from the outside world, life is isolated and patriotism localised. The least open of the valleys of France, that of the Garonne, is also that of which the population has most energetically resisted centripetal influences. Toulouse still murmurs at the memory of that defeat which made it subordinate to Paris, and it is by no means certain that Bordeaux, and all the Midi, do not complain that they have been sacrificed to the provinces of the north.

The Loire and the Seine, on the other hand, between which communication is easy, have almost always lived under the same laws. Paris and Orleans were the two towns of the patrimony of the French kings, and the first acquisition of the monarchy was Bourges. Three centuries later, Charles VII., expelled from Paris, found a refuge there. The Valois seem even to have hesitated between the two rivers. Their sumptuous chateaux are at Fontainebleau and Amboise, St. Germain and Chambord. Blois and Tours were for some time the capitals of Henry III. and Henry IV. The Saône also has almost always

been in dependence on the Seine. The Burgundians paid tribute to Clovis before the Visigoths of Toulouse, and Burgundy never afterwards had more than Capetian dukes. As early as 1310, Philip IV. laid hold of Lyons; in 1349 Philip VI. bought Grenoble and Montpellier; yet the English held Bordeaux for a century after that.

Unity and Position of the French Territory in the True Centre of Europe.—One of the great causes of the physical, and hence of the moral, unity of France is certainly to be found in this facility of communication between the different river basins. They flow into all the seas, but they are readily united with each other. The country affords an example of unity in diversity. And this is the best condition for the development of a great nation and of a powerful civilisation. It may be added that while France is not in the literal or material sense the centre of Europe, she yet occupies a central position in regard to the European seas, since the Mediterranean, the Bay of Biscay, the Channel, and North Sea wash her shores, and in regard to the chief nations of the continent, since she has as her neighbours Spain, Italy, Switzerland, Germany, and England. From these facts have resulted the lengthy wars and the dangers into which she has so often run; but from the same facts has arisen the influence which she has been so often able to exercise beyond her borders.

These points require careful consideration, for only a serious study of the geographical position of France, of her physical configuration, of her soil, and of her climate, can explain the general characteristics of her history. Certain noteworthy details must be added. France includes in her population representatives of all the European races except the Slavs; she possesses also all the geological terrains of the continent, all its climates, the climate of the French plains being the normal climate of Europe. She possesses all the vegetables, 3660 species, or 1380 more than Germany, 2290 more than England, and may rightly be termed the garden of Europe. Finally, the French language, being that which is most easily acquired by foreigners, has become the common medium for the transmission of ideas.

A SHORT HISTORY OF FRANCE

THE FIRST PERIOD—INDEPENDENT GAUL

(1600 B.C.—50 B.C.)

CHAPTER I

PRIMITIVE PEOPLES—MANNERS AND CUSTOMS (1600–50 B.C.)

Primitive Peoples.—Three or four hundred tribes, divided into three great families, the Celts or Gaels, the Belgae or Kymri, and the Iberians or Gascons, formerly divided between them the territory of Gaul.

Celts or Gaels.—The Celts are supposed to have set out from the plains of central Asia in company with the ancestors of those Pelasgi who settled in Greece and Italy, and of the Slavs who remained in eastern Europe. The date of this migration is unknown, but it was long before that of the Germanic tribes who subsequently settled between the Vistula and the Rhine. The Celts advanced westwards to the very shores of the Atlantic, where they saw high cliffs shining white on the horizon and resolved to reach them. They extended their dominion over that great island which lies opposite Gaul, nor did they stay their course until from the summits of the farthest capes of Scotland and Ireland they saw before them only the immensity of the ocean. They could advance no farther; the long journey which had begun in Bactria was completed. The Celts spread and increased over this vast territory, preserving no traces of their Asiatic origin except certain religious beliefs, including, perhaps, the organisation of their priestly caste, and an idiom which, while more divergent from Sanscrit, the sacred language of the Brahmins, than Greek or Latin, was yet closely allied to it, and which serves to reveal the kinship of the Celts or Gauls with the other nations of the great Indo-European family. This language is found to-day in the heart of Brittany, on some coins which have been unearthed in Wales, and in the north of Scotland and Ireland; those who speak it are the last representatives

of this ancient people. Some ruins also remain to bear witness to the imposing grandeur of its lost monuments.

Iberians or Basques.—The Celts, however, found a people already established in Gaul before their coming. The Iberians, who possibly came from the north of Africa and Spain, occupied all the country south of the Loire ; they were specially numerous to the south of the Garonne under the name of Aquitainians, and to the south of the Durance under the name of Ligurian Saliens. Their language was that which is still spoken by the Gascons or Basques in a part of the Pyrenees, and has no connection with any other European idiom.

Belgae or Kymri.—The Kymri arrived last. According to tradition, they crossed the Rhine at some point on its lower course, about 600 B.C., under the leadership of Hu, the mighty warrior, legislator, and priest ; they spread over northern Gaul, even passing the Loire and occupying some of the western districts as far as the Garonne. Their settlement is said not to have been accomplished without lengthy wars, which disturbed the whole of Gaul and induced the emigration of the tribes which they dispossessed. Legend records that some of these passed the Alps under Bellovesius, others the Rhine under Sigovesius.

Phoenicians.—The bold sailors of Tyre and Carthage, who so early explored all the shores of the Mediterranean, appeared at the mouths of the Rhône. At first they were content to trade with the natives, but later, in obedience to that instinct for colonisation which led them to plant settlements on the shores of Africa, Sicily, and Spain, they penetrated into the interior of the country. The legend of the labours of the Tyrian Hercules conceals the authentic history of the expeditions and settlement of the Phoenician race in Gaul. The god, according to the story, reached the banks of the Rhône, where he was compelled to fight a fierce battle. His arrows were spent and he was about to succumb, when his father came to his help. Jupiter caused a rain of stones to fall from heaven and this supplied the hero with new weapons. These stones are still to be seen ; the great plain of la Crau is entirely strewn with them. After his victory, Hercules founded near the spot the town of Nîmes, and in the heart of Gaul that of Alesia. The valley of the Rhône being thus acquired for commerce and civilisation, the hero returned towards the Alps where the gods beheld him scattering the clouds and shattering the mountain tops. Hercules burst open the Col de Tenda, and formed a road from Italy to Spain over the levelled Alps. In distant ages, men loved to attribute to the invincible

arm of a hero the work of countless generations, or deeds which the forces of nature themselves have accomplished.

The Greeks.—The Phoenicians preceded the Greeks in the control of the Mediterranean, but were supplanted by them in Gaul. The Rhodians established themselves at the mouths of the Rhône, while the Phoenician colonies in the interior fell into the hands of the native population. About 600 B.C., the Phoceans founded Marseilles. The Greeks told a poetical story of the foundation of this city. "A Phocean merchant," says the legend, "landed on the coast of Gaul some distance from the mouth of the Rhône, at a point in the dominion of Nann, the chief of the Segobriges, who received the stranger well and invited him to the betrothal festivities of his daughter. According to custom, the young maiden herself offered a cup to that one of her father's guests whom she chose for her husband. When she entered at the end of the feast, bearing the full cup, she paused before the Phocean. Nann accepted his daughter's choice, and gave to the stranger the gulf at which he had landed. At that point Euxenus laid the foundations of Marseilles."

Character, Manners, and Customs.—Despite the divergence in their origin, there was a marked similarity in the customs of all the Celtic and Belgic tribes, which, to foreign observers, appeared to form a single people. The Greeks and Romans saw only Gauls in Gaul, since everywhere they found the same bravery. "They are an untamed race," they said, "who fight not only with men, but also with nature and with the Gods. When it thunders they shoot their arrows at the heavens; they take up arms against a tempest; they march, sword in hand, against rivers in flood or the storm-tossed ocean." And they were rendered still more redoubtable by the fact that their magnanimity was equal to their courage. "Among this frank and simple race," says Strabo, "each resents the wrongs done to his neighbour, and with such sincerity that they all promptly combine to exact recompense."

Diodorus Siculus paints a portrait of the Gauls. "They are tall, with fair skin and hair. Some cut their beards, others allow them to grow to a moderate length, but the nobles shave their chins and wear moustaches which conceal their mouths. They eat, not seated on chairs, but reclining on the skins of wolves and dogs. Beside them are great fires before which are cauldrons and spits from which hang whole quarters of meat. The chiefs are honoured by being offered the best portions. The Gauls also invite strangers to their feasts, and it is only when the meal

is ended that they ask who they are and why they have come into their land. Often during the feasts their speech gives rise to quarrels, and since they despise death, they challenge one another to single combat."

The same writer adds, "The Gauls are terrifying to behold. Their accents are loud and harsh; they speak little, express their meaning by imagery, and it is their affectation to leave most things to the imagination. They are much given to exaggeration, both in praising themselves and in abusing their enemies. Their speech is threatening, their manner haughty and tragic, but they possess intelligence and are able to learn. Among them are poets, called bards, who sing verses of praise or abuse, accompanying themselves on the rotte, an instrument similar to the lyre."

Dress and Arms.—"The Gauls wear a singular dress. They have striped tunics of various colours, and stockings which they call *braies*. Striped cloaks made of a material of small multicoloured squares, heavy in winter, light in summer, are hung to their shoulders with clasps. As defensive arms, they have shields of the height of a man, each of which bears some special mark. As these shields serve not only for defence but for adornment also, some have embossed brass figures on them, worked with considerable skill. Their brass helmets are adorned with large points, which give them a fantastic appearance. To some of these helmets horns are fixed; to others the figures of birds or beasts in relief. They have barbarous trumpets of a peculiar construction, which give a raucous note appropriate to the tumult of battle. Some wear breastplates of iron mail; others fight naked. In place of long swords, they carry short swords hung on their right side by chains of brass or iron. Some trim their tunics with gold or silver edgings. Their swords are no longer than the javelins of other races, and their *saunies*, heavy pikes which they throw, have points longer than their swords. Of these *saunies*, some are straight, and others so curved that they not only pierce but also tear the flesh, and when the weapon is taken out the wound is increased."

Method of Fighting.—"Both for travelling and for fighting they use very largely two-horsed chariots, each bearing a driver and a warrior. From these they hurl their *saunies*, and then descend to attack the enemy with their swords. Some of them so despise death as to enter the battle without any defensive armour except a girdle round their bodies. They carry with them servants, who are freemen, and whom they employ as

drivers and as guards. Before delivering an attack, it is their custom to sally forth from their ranks and to challenge the bravest of their foes to single combat, while they brandish their arms to terrify their opponents. If any accept the challenge, they sing the prowess of their ancestors, extol their own courage, and insult their foes. They behead their conquered enemies, hanging the heads to their horses' necks and nailing them up in their houses as trophies. If the enemy is renowned, they preserve his head in cedar oil, and they have been known to refuse to sell such a head for its weight in gold."

Customs.—Women were free to choose their own husbands. They received a dower, but the husband had to supply a sum of equal amount from his property. The total was possessed in common and passed to the survivor. A boy might not address his father in public until he was of age to bear arms, and a man had the power of life and death over his wife and children. "When the father of a family of high birth dies," says Caesar, "his relatives assemble, and if there is any suspicion attaching to his death, his wives are examined; if their guilt is proved, they are burned to death amid horrible tortures. Funerals are magnificent. Everything which the dead man is supposed to have loved, even animals, are cast into the grave, and a short while before Caesar's expedition those slaves and dependants whom the deceased man was known to have loved were buried with him." Relatives often placed on the bier letters to their kindred, in the belief that the dead would read them.

Religion.—The Gauls worshipped especially the forces of nature, thunder, stars, rivers, the ocean, lakes, and the wind. *Kirk* was the south wind, so terrible in the Rhône valley; *Tarann*, the god of thunder; *Bel*, the sun god; *Pennin*, the genius of the Alps; *Arduine*, that of the vast forest of the Ardennes. At a later date, the druids doubtless urged them to adore moral and intellectual powers—*Hésus*, the god of war; *Teutatès*, the god of commerce and the inventor of the arts; *Ogmius*, the god of poetry and eloquence, who was represented with chains of gold issuing from his mouth to seize and hold those who heard him. The festival of Teutatès was celebrated in the forest by torchlight on the first night of the new year. The chief priest with a golden sickle then cut down the mistletoe, a parasitic plant which grows on the branches of certain trees and which played a great part in the religious ceremonies and in the medicine of the Gauls. But they only prized mistletoe which grew on the oak, their sacred tree. Before a battle they

often vowed the spoils of the enemy to Hèsus, and after a victory they sacrificed to him what remained of the cattle which they had seized. "The surplus of the booty," says Caesar, "was placed in a public depôt; in most towns heaps of the spoils could be seen stored in the holy places. It amounted to contempt for religion for a Gaul to appropriate secretly that which he had taken in war or to rob one of these depôts; the cruellest punishment and torture were reserved for this type of theft."

The Druids.—The priests of the Gauls, the druids, or men of the oak, had lofty beliefs which seemed to be an echo of the great religions of India. They believed in punishments and rewards in a future life. But they believed also in horrible superstitions, and the blood of human sacrifices stained the great altars which they built in the depth of primaeval forests or among the wild moors. "All the Gauls," says Caesar, "are superstitious; both those who are attacked by serious illness and those who are living in the midst of war and danger sacrifice human victims, or swear that they will do so, having recourse for the performance of their vows to the druids. They think that the life of a man is needed to redeem the life of another man from death, and that by the payment of such a price the immortal gods may be appeased; they have even established public sacrifices of this kind. They have sometimes idols of great size, made of osier, the interior of which they fill with living men; these they set on fire, and cause their victims to perish in the flames. They think that the sacrifice of those who have been convicted of theft, brigandage, or any other crime, is most pleasing to the immortal gods, but when such men cannot be found the innocent suffer instead."

All the druids were subordinate to a chief, whose authority was unlimited. "At his death, the most eminent in dignity succeeded him, or if there were many with equal claims, a successor was elected by the votes of all the druids, and the position was sometimes the subject of armed conflict. At a certain time of year they met together in a consecrated place on the frontier of the land of the Carnutes, which was held to be the centre of all Gaul. All who had disputes to settle came to this place from every part of the country, and they obeyed the judgments and decisions of the druids. It was believed that their creed originated in Britain and that it was thence brought over to Gaul. In Caesar's time, those who wished to acquire a more complete knowledge of it usually resorted to that island to receive instruction. The druids did not go to war nor did they pay any of the

taxes imposed upon the other Gauls. Attracted by such extensive privileges, many Gauls attempted to enter the priesthood, but to do so it was needful to learn by heart a great number of verses, and to pass through a novitiate of nine years. It was forbidden to commit these verses to writing, though, in the majority of their public and private affairs, they made use of Greek letters. In the opinion of Caesar, two reasons might be assigned for this law; the first, a wish to prevent their knowledge from becoming known to the many: the second, fear lest their disciples, relying on writing, should neglect their memories. A belief which they specially laboured to promote was that souls do not perish, and that after death they pass from one body to another, a belief which appeared to them to be eminently calculated to promote courage by removing fear of death. The motion of the stars, the immensity of the universe, the grandeur of the earth, the nature of the material world, the strength and power of the immortal gods, were, amongst other subjects, the topics of their discussions; they handed down their knowledge to the young."

Some of their aphorisms were, "Great care must be taken in the education of children"; "Money spent in this world will be restored in the world to come"; "Those who kill themselves that they may die with their friends will find them in the other world"; "All fathers of families are kings in their own houses."

Bards, Diviners, and Prophetesses.—Connected with the order of druids, were the bards, diviners, and prophetesses. These last, renowned magicians, loved to live in wild caverns, dashed by some stormy sea. The nine druidesses of the Ile de Sein, at the western point of Brittany, were credited with knowledge of the future; it was believed that by their words they could calm or raise tempests. Others who inhabited an islet at the mouth of the Loire were obliged at a certain season of the year to destroy and rebuild the shrine of their god. As soon as the first ray of sunlight appeared the hut was shattered under their repeated blows, and another temple was quickly erected in its place. But woe to one who allowed a single piece of the material of the new building to fall. She was speedily torn in pieces by the hands of her sisters, maddened by the event, and her bloody flesh was scattered before the sacred edifice.

The *ouadds*, or *diviners*, were concerned with the whole material side of religion. They sought to discover a revelation of the future in the entrails of a victim or in the flight of birds.

A Gaul undertook no important act without having recourse to the divination of an *ouadd*. Such was the constant curiosity of primitive peoples. They knew nothing of the past, nothing of the present; their sole desire was to penetrate the darkness of the future.

While the power of the druids was undisputed, the bards were the sacred poets summoned to all religious ceremonies. When the military leaders had freed themselves from the domination of the priests, the bards sang in praise of the powerful and the rich. From singers of gods and heroes they became courtiers of men. They were found at the tables of the great, winning by their verses the right to be seated there. One arrived too late when Luern, king of the Arverni, had already entered his chariot; the bard followed the chariot which was driving away, lamenting in a slow and sad measure the fate of a poet whom time had mocked. Luern was charmed and threw him a purse of gold. Forthwith the *rotte* sounded once more; its chords were struck to a joyous note, and the bard sang, "O king, may gold grow under the wheels of thy chariot; fortune and happiness fall from thy hands."

Druidical Monuments.—In the western districts of France many monuments called druidical may still be found; they are the *peulvans* or *menhirs*, vast blocks of rough stone, either fixed alone in the earth or arranged in rows. In the latter case, they form *alignments*, such as those of Carnac, which are set up in eleven parallel lines in a space of 1500 metres and present a curious spectacle in this barren land. In the past, they were held to be an army of giants suddenly turned to stone as they advanced to some titanic encounter. The *cromlechs* are menhirs arranged in a single circle or in many concentric circles, sometimes around a more lofty menhir; the *dolmens* are great altars formed of one or more great flat stones placed horizontally on many vertical stones. They are known in many departments under such names as *Pierre levée, Pierre couverte, Pierre levade, Table du Diable, Tuile des fées, Allée couverte.* Some of these stones are seven metres in length and of the same breadth.

These strange monuments occasionally bear great carvings of various kinds. Crescents, round holes arranged in circles, spirals, figures which possibly represent animals or trees interlaced with each other may be found on them. Thus in the Vosges, on the peak of Donon, from which it is possible to see in a single view a great part of Lorraine, Alsace, and the grand duchy of Baden, there is to be found a great slab, and by its side blocks

of scattered sandstone, which bear on them figures of natural grandeur deeply engraved. It is the tomb of Pharamond, according to the local legends ; in all probability it is a druidical monument. The place is well chosen, from it can be seen one of those magnificent views which enable a man without effort to turn his thoughts from earth to God.

The most famous of the druidical monuments are those of Carnac, of Lock-Maria-Ker, and of the moor of Haut-Brien in Brittany ; the covered way or dolmen of Bagneux near Saumur, known under the name of Roche aux Fées, which is twenty metres long, sixteen wide, and three high ; that of Essé, twenty-eight kilometres from Rennes ; the *Pierre branlante* of Perros-Guyrech, in the Côtes du Nord, which is fourteen metres long and seven broad, and so perfectly balanced that one man is able to rock it though its weight is 500,000 kilograms. A great number of similar stones are to be found in Brittany, along the Loire, in Poitou, Auvergne, and as far as the Cevennes. Another kind of monument is the *tumuli*, mounds of earth which cover a tomb. That of Cumiac is more than thirty metres high.

Ideas live no less than granite. Some remains of druidical ceremonies were practised only two centuries ago in the forests of Dauphiné ; traces of others may still be discovered in the heart of the country.

Government.—The druids, ministers of a bloody religion and the sole repositories of all knowledge, reigned for long by means of their intellectual superiority and of the terror which they inspired. Some three centuries before our era, after terrible convulsions, the chiefs of the tribes and the nobles seem to have cast off the yoke of the priesthood. But the military aristocracy, after its victory, came into contact with two enemies. Some of their own number, of greater ability or courage, united several tribes and made themselves kings. In other districts, the lower classes, and especially the inhabitants of the towns, revolted. The druids joined the rebels against the nobles who had dispossessed them, and in most of the cities aristocratic or monarchic government was abolished and replaced by a democratic government more or less mingled with the ancient elements. In one city the nobles and the priests formed a senate and nominated the *vergobret* or annual judge, and when necessary, a leader in war ; in another the people themselves appointed a senate or magistrates ; sometimes even a king continued to reign in dependence on a general assembly and on the priests. An ancient writer remarks that the kings of Gaul, on their golden

thrones, in the midst of all their pomp and magnificence, were only the ministers and servants of their priests.

State of Gaul in 58 B.C.—This revolution had been accomplished when Caesar undertook the conquest of the Gauls. "In that land," he says, "he found no class of men honoured except the druids and the nobles. As for the masses, their condition was little better than that of slaves, since burdened with debt, crushed under taxes and the encroachments of the nobles, the majority of free men delivered themselves into slavery. The druids, the ministers of the rites of religion, performed sacrifices both for the tribes and for individuals; they were the judges of the people, and cognisant of practically all public and private disputes. When a crime was committed, when a murder took place, when a dispute arose about an inheritance, or about boundaries, they decided the matter; they awarded compensation and inflicted punishments. If a private individual or a public man would not submit to their decision, they excluded him from the sacrifices; this punishment was very rare among them. Those who fell under this interdict were classed among the impious and criminals; every one refused intercourse with them, fearing to be infected by the evil which had fallen upon them; all recourse to justice was denied them and they could attain to no honour."

"The second class was that of the nobles. When they undertook any war—and some war occurred every year before the coming of Caesar—they bore all their arms, and the number of their servants and clients by whom they were surrounded was proportionate to the reputation of their birth and their wealth. Some of these clients devoted themselves to their chief, for life and death; among the Aquitainians, these men were called *soldures*. Their status was such that they shared all the good things of life with those to whom they were bound by a bond of friendship. If their chief died a violent death, they also shared his fate, dying by their own hand, nor, within living memory, had there been any recorded instance of those who were united with a chief by such a pact refusing on his death to die also."

"In the cities which were credited with the best management of their public affairs, there was a sacred law that any one who learned either from his neighbours or by public report news of moment to his city should at once inform the magistrate, without communicating it to any one else, experience having taught them that rash and ignorant men often become alarmed

by false rumours, and are thus moved to crimes and to the adoption of violent lines of conduct. The magistrates used their discretion in suppressing information, only revealing to the people as much as they thought it good for them to know. Only in the assembly might public affairs be discussed."

Industry.—The Phoenicians and the Greeks brought to Gaul the art of working mines, and the Aedui (Burgundy) had manufactures of gold and silver. The Bituriges (Berry) manufactured iron. This last people also discovered the art, which has remained traditional among them, and among the Arverni (Auvergne), of fusing tin on to copper. The Aedui invented plating, and by this means ornamented the bits and harness of their horses. King Bituit had a chariot entirely plated with silver. "Gaul made no less progress," says an able historian of the Gauls, "in the art of weaving and figuring cloth; their dyeing was not without reputation. In agriculture, they had wheeled ploughs, sieves made of hair, and used marl as manure. They made various kinds of fermented drinks, among which were barley beer and wheaten beer mixed with hydromel." They do not appear, however, to have cultivated wheat before the time of Augustus. Though they had little wine, to them is attributed the invention of tuns in which to preserve it. Some of their coins still exist. On some is found a horse without a bridle, or a wild boar, symbolical alike of liberty and war.

Commerce.—Commerce could not have been very extensive since Gaul possessed few articles of export. But the Sequanians (Franche Comté) sent their salt provisions down the Saône to Marseilles, whence they spread over Italy and Greece. Gaul also exported thick cloth, and had much commercial intercourse with the island of Britain, the centre of the trade with which was Corbilo at the mouth of the Loire.

CHAPTER II

MIGRATIONS OF THE GAULS (1600 B.C.–123 B.C.)

Invasion of Spain.—The reputation of the Gauls for daring stood higher than that of any of the barbarous peoples of antiquity; every land experienced to its cost the courage of the Gallic race, whose warlike temper led them to invade all countries bordering on their own. They made trial of fortune

beyond the Alps and Pyrenees, in the valley of the Danube, in Greece, and even in Asia.

Having driven the Aquitainians from the banks of the Loire beyond those of the Garonne, they penetrated at some unknown period into Spain, and the Celtiberians, the tribe which afterwards offered the most vigorous resistance to the Romans, were, as their name implies, formed by a mingling of Celts with Iberians. Numantia, "the second terror of Rome," was a city belonging to this people, while in the southern extremity of Lusitania there was found a small tribe known as the *Celtici*.

Invasions of Italy and taking of Rome.—The Gauls are said to have twice crossed the Alps, once under the name of Umbrians, and again as the Insubres, Cenomanni, Boii, and Senones. In the dim ages of antiquity, they twice conquered those northern districts of Italy in which their descendants have so often fought. Their wars with Rome were long and bloody, and alone of all the enemies of the Republic they broke through those walls which Pyrrhus and Hannibal could but view and curse from a distance.

According to the half-mythical story of their invasion it was in the year 390 B.C. that 30,000 Gauls of the tribe of the Senones crossed the Apennines, invaded Etruria, and demanded from the people of Clusium the cession of their lands. The latter in terror closed their gates and implored the aid of Rome. The senate despatched envoys, the three Fabii, to interpose their mediation. "By what right do you attack the Etruscans?" asked Q. Ambustus. "We bear our right as you Romans, at the point of our sword, for all things belong to the brave," answered the Senonian chief. The Fabii were angered by such boldness; forgetting their character as ambassadors, they joined the besieged in a sortie, and one of them, Q. Ambustus, even slew in view of the two armies a Gallic chief whose arms he captured.

The barbarians forthwith abandoned their attack on Clusium and demanded reparation from Rome. The whole body of the *Feciales*, in the name of religion, insisted that justice should be done, but the influence of the Fabian *gens* carried the day. The guilty were acquitted, and the people, as if struck by madness, selected them as three of the six military tribunes.

At this news the Senones, reinforced by some bands from the banks of the Po, marched on Rome, without attacking a single town or plundering a single village on their route. They marched down the left bank of the Tiber, until, having approached to within half a day's journey of the city, they found by the Allia

a Roman army drawn up in a long line on the farther bank, its centre occupying the plain, its right posted on the hills, its left covered by the Tiber. The attack was first delivered on the side of the hills, where the right wing, composed of veteran soldiers, held firm. But the centre, terror-struck by the shouts and by the savage appearance of the barbarians, who advanced striking their shields with their weapons, broke its ranks and threw the left wing into disorder. All who failed to swim the Tiber and take refuge behind the walls of Veii perished in the plain or in the banks and bed of the river. The right wing, which remained intact, retreated towards Rome, and without garrisoning the walls or closing the gates, hastened to occupy the citadel upon the Capitoline Hill (July 16, 390). Fortunately for them, the barbarians waited to plunder, to behead the dead, and to celebrate by orgies their easy victory. Rome had a respite in which to recover from her stupor and to take measures which might yet redeem her reputation. The senate, the magistrates, the priests, and a thousand of the bravest among the patrician youth fortified themselves in the Capitol. They carried thither the gold of the temples and all the provisions in the city, while the bulk of the population covered the neighbouring roads and scattered among the neighbouring cities. Caere afforded an asylum to the vestals and to the sacred things.

On the evening after the battle, the watch fires of the Gauls were seen, but astonished to find the walls unguarded by soldiers and the gates open, the barbarians feared some ambush, and delayed until the following day their entry into the city. The streets were silent, the houses deserted ; only in some the barbarians saw with amazement old men seated in their ivory chairs wearing long robes bordered with purple, holding long batons and preserving a calm and impassive mien. These were the men of consular rank, who had offered themselves as victims for the republic, or who had refused to seek refuge among their former subjects. The barbarians thought them to be statues or supernatural beings, but Parpirius struck with his baton a Gaul who had gently passed his hand over his long beard. The Gaul in anger slew him, and this was the signal for a massacre. Nothing living was spared, and after the city had been sacked, the houses were burned.

The barbarians had only seen soldiers and warlike preparations at the Capitol. They attempted to scale it, but as the road up the height was narrow and steep, the Romans had little difficulty in repulsing them, and it became necessary to convert the siege

into a blockade. For seven months the Gauls remained encamped among the ruins of Rome. One day they saw a young Roman slowly descend from the Capitol, wearing priestly dress and bearing in his hand consecrated things ; he was one of the Fabian *gens*. Heeding neither shouts nor threats, he crossed the camp, slowly ascended the Quirinal, and there accomplished the expiatory sacrifices. Then with equal calmness he returned, as little hindered, by the route which he had followed before. Admiring his courage, or struck by superstitious fear, the Gauls allowed him to pass.

"The gods are appeased," said the Romans; "fortune will change." Change it did, since there was perseverance and courage on the one side, blind confidence on the other. In their thoughtlessness, the barbarians had neither reserves of provisions nor means of shelter ; a wet autumn produced an epidemic which decimated them, and famine drove them to spread in small bands all over the surrounding country. The Latins and Etruscans, who had rejoiced at the misfortunes of Rome, were in their turn alarmed. Camillus, the ablest general of the Republic, was then in exile at Ardua ; that city supplied him with soldiers with whom he surprised and massacred a detachment of the Gauls. This initial success reanimated the defence ; on all sides the peasants armed, and the Romans, who were refugees at Veii, proclaimed Camillus dictator. The sanction of the senate was needed to confirm this election. A young plebeian, Cominius, swam the Tiber at night, evaded the enemy's sentries, and availing himself of the briars and arbutus which clothed the steep slopes of the Capitol, climbed up to the citadel. He made the return journey with equal success and bore back to Veii a senatorial commission which served to remove the scruples of Camillus. But the Gauls had noticed his footprints, and on a dark night they ascended to the foot of the rampart. They had already reached the battlements, when the screaming of the geese, dedicated to Juno, awoke Manlius, a patrician renowned for his strength and courage. He hurled down the foremost assailants from the height of the wall. The garrison soon manned the ramparts, and few of the Gauls succeeded in regaining their camp. Thanks to Manlius, the Capitol was saved, but supplies were exhausted, and as Camillus did not appear, the military tribune Sulpicius agreed with the barbarian chief (recalled to his own land by an attack of the Veneti) that the Gauls should retire on receipt of a ransom of one thousand pounds of gold and of food and means of transport to be supplied by the allies of Rome.

When the gold was weighed, the barbarians produced false weights. Sulpicius complained, but the chief cried *Vae victis!* and forthwith threw into the scale his large sword and his belt. The barbarians retired, but Camillus repudiated the treaty in virtue of his dictatorship. He ordered the allied towns to close their gates and to attack stragglers and isolated bands. In the course of the blockade, in which almost 70,000 Gauls had taken part, numerous detachments had left the siege to range over the country. One party had penetrated into Apulia; when it returned, the main body of the army had retired, all Latium was in arms, and the Roman legions were reorganised. Very few of these escaped. The people of Caere massacred a whole troop which fell into their hands at night owing to an ambush; another band was annihilated by Camillus near a town, the name of which has not come down to us. Roman pride converted these trifling successes into a complete victory, and declared that not a single barbarian escaped the avenging sword of the soldiers of Camillus.

Wars of Rome against the Cisalpine Gauls (283–192).—For a hundred years Rome was unable to avenge this affront. Then, in 283, the consul Dolabella entered the land of the Senones with superior forces. He burned the villages, slew the men, sold the children and women into slavery, and only left the country after having converted it into a desert. Rome boasted that not one of the race whose fathers had fought at the Allia survived; that the ransom of the Capitol was found and taken amid the treasures of the Senones. But despite these proud assertions, it was not until 232 that the senate dared to divide among the poorer citizens the land taken from the Senones. The Boii, who occupied the adjoining territory, refused to allow the Romans to establish themselves so near them, and in response to their appeal almost all the Cisalpine Gauls took up arms. A formidable army of 50,000 foot and 20,000 horse advanced upon Rome. Terror was at its height in the city; the Sibylline books were consulted and required the sacrifice of two Gauls, who were forthwith buried alive in the middle of the cattle market. A "tumult" was then proclaimed; all, even the priests, took arms; 150,000 men were drawn up before Rome, while 620,000 soldiers supplied by the allies were held in reserve. All Italy rose to repulse the Gauls. They approached within three days' march of Rome, but surrounded by two armies, near Cape Telamon, they left 40,000 men on the field of battle (225).

The senate resolved to put forth great efforts to save Italy

from a repetition of such dangers. Two consuls crossed the Po, but the Insubres met their attack with vigour, and they were glad to accept a truce which allowed them to retire without fighting. They reached the land of the Cenomanni, and when, after some days of rest and plenty, they had revived their troops, they ignored the treaty and, advancing along the foot of the Alps, again entered the territory of the Insubres. An army of 50,000 strong attempted to punish this treachery, but was defeated ; a second host of 30,000 allies, which came from Gaul to the help of the Insubres, could not save them. Their king, Virdumar, was slain by Marcellus in single combat, and on his return to Rome the consul celebrated a triumph of peculiar splendour, receiving the third and last *spolia opima*.

The Cisalpine Gauls appeared to have been subdued when Hannibal descended the Alps with a Carthaginian army. He encountered no obstacle in his march from the Pyrenees to the Rhône, but a Gallic tribe, disturbed by his presence in the midst of their land, attempted to bar his passage of that river. He easily overcame such isolated resistance, and on the other bank of the Rhône met the envoys of the Boii who offered to guide him across the Alps. After the victories of the Ticino and Trebia the Cisalpine Gauls crowded to his camp ; they followed his march upon Rome, and it was with Gallic blood that he gained the victories of Lake Trasimene and Cannae.

This extraordinary struggle lasted for sixteen years, and when at last it ended on the field of Zama, the Cisalpines had long forgotten Rome and their subjection to her. But the senate remembered them ; the work of conquest, which the coming of Hannibal had interrupted, was resumed, and the legions did not halt until they had made the line of the Alps the frontier of the Republic. The Boii, a Gallic tribe, refused to accept the yoke of Rome. They preferred to abandon the land which they had occupied for four centuries and sought a home where they might remain free on the banks of the Danube, in the two lands which preserve their name, Bojohemum (Bohemia) and Bojaria (Bavaria) (192).

Invasions of Greece.—At the period which tradition assigns to the passage of the Alps by Bellovesius and the Insubres, and their conquest of the valley of the Po, other Gallic tribes, under Sigovesus, are said to have entered the valley of the Danube. Here they remained lost to history for three centuries. Alexander met them when he approached the Danube, and they sent an embassy to him. "What do you fear?"

the young conqueror asked them, expecting that they would render homage to his valour. "That the heavens will not fall," was the answer. "The Celts are bold," remarked Alexander, and granted to them the title of allies and friends. Half a century later they reappear in arms and aggressive. Alexander was dead; his empire had fallen into an amazing confusion, and the Gauls sold their services to some of his successors. But, about 280 B.C., three tribes, the Tolistoboii, Trocmes, and Tectosages, arrived from Gaul itself, united with the tribes already on the Danube, and decided to invade Macedonia and Thrace on their own account. A *brenn* or general-in-chief was chosen, and a formidable army entered Macedonia. The phalanx was overthrown; three successive kings of Macedonia perished, and the whole plain fell under the power of the Gauls. "From the summit of the walls of their towns," says Justin, "the inhabitants raised their hands to heaven, invoking the names of Philip and Alexander, the protecting deities of their native land."

The Gauls retired in order to secure their booty, and Macedonia breathed again. During the winter, however, the *brenn* prepared new forces; in the spring of 279 he again invaded the country, destroyed the last Macedonian army, and, if terror has not led the Greeks to exaggerate the numbers of their assailants, proceeded to descend into Thessaly at the head of 150,000 infantry and 20,000 cavalry. Such brave spirits as yet survived in Greece gathered at Thermopylae to check this host, and the last fleet of Athens assembled in the Malic Gulf to assist in the defence of the defile.

Energetically repulsed from the pass of Thermopylae, the Gauls discovered the footpath which had once laid Greece open to Xerxes, and curiously enough it was now no better guarded than it had been at the time of the Persian invasion. They hurried to Delphi in order to pillage its treasures. Legend relates that the god, when consulted, answered that he knew well how to defend himself, that an earthquake opened the ground under the feet of the barbarians, and caused the rocks to fall on their heads, while tempest and lightning consumed those of the Gauls who had not perished under the uprooted mountains. This story, a repetition of another of the time of the Persian invasion, is but a poetic version of a resistance organised by the inhabitants of a country well suited for defence. Repulsed from Delphi, the retreat of the Gauls was rendered disastrous by the mountaineers. Hunger and cold inflicted horrible sufferings on them;

their leader, severely wounded, committed suicide in order to escape the anger of his soldiers or from shame at his defeat (278).

The Gauls in the Valley of the Danube.—The remains of the Gallic army returned to the north. Some halted on the banks of the Danube, where they formed the great people of the Scordisci; others joined their companions who were encamped in Thrace. The Gauls of the Danube continued to sell their services to the highest bidder. They supplied Pyrrhus with his best troops, and that prince, who appreciated their courage, was so proud of having conquered the Gallic allies of his rival Antigonus, that he caused their spoils to be gathered from the battlefield and hung from the walls of the temple of Minerva Itodides, with these words engraven beneath them: "Pyrrhus the Molossian, having destroyed the army of Antigonus, offered to Minerva the bucklers of the brave Gauls." At a later date, the Scordisci came into conflict with the legions of the senate, and annihilated yet another legion of the Roman army. After ravaging the whole of Illyria they advanced towards Italy, shooting their arrows in anger at the waves of the Adriatic which barred their further progress. Soon afterwards they collected once more on the Danube, where they were absorbed in the multitude of the barbarous peoples of that district, which the emperors eventually reduced into a province.

The Gauls in Asia (Galatians).—The Gauls of Thrace had a more brilliant fate. Two princes then disputed the throne of Bithynia in Asia Minor, and one of them, Nicomedes, took the Gauls into his pay. They placed him on the throne, and then, finding the land was fertile, its inhabitants unwarlike, its cities rich, they overran the peninsula, holding princes and people to ransom during forty years. "The kings of the East," says Justin, "dared not undertake any war unless they had these barbarians on their side. Such was the terror that the mere name of Gaul inspired, such was the persistent good fortune of their arms, that without their help reigning princes believed their positions to be insecure, while a deposed ruler ever believed that with their aid he might regain his power." Some of these bands encamped on the site of Troy, where mediaeval chroniclers placed the original home of the Franks. Others sacked the territory of the Greek colonies, and some touching verses are extant recording the fate of three Milesian virgins who slew themselves to escape the outrages of the barbarians. "O Miletus, dear country of our birth, we die that we may not fall

victims to the unbridled licence of the cruel Galatians. Three young maidens are we, three of thy citizens, driven to this fate by the warlike violence of the Celts. We could not await the hour when our blood should be shed by some impious murderer; we could not endure their embraces. And in Death we found our saviour."

Gathering eventually in the heart of the peninsula, under various chiefs or "tetrarchs," they established themselves in the district which from them took the name of Galatia. When the Roman legions had conquered Antiochus, King of Syria, at Magnesia, and driven him back beyond Mount Taurus, they would not leave this threatening people uncurbed in the heart of Asia Minor. The consul Manlius conducted a successful expedition against them; the barbarians were divided and defeated in detail (189). Among the prisoners taken was Chiomara, wife of the "tetrarch" Ortiagon. A Roman centurion ravished her, but she obtained from him the promise of her liberty on condition that she paid a sum of money which a Gallic slave was to fetch. When night came, the centurion led Chiomara to the banks of a river where the exchange was to be effected. He went alone, in order that he might not be obliged to share the ransom, which two relatives of the captive brought to the spot. While the Roman counted the gold, Chiomara in her own tongue ordered the Gauls to kill him; then she took his head, and going to her husband, threw it at his feet, informing him at the same time of the wrong which she had suffered and of the vengeance which she had taken.

Rome, content with having conquered the Gauls, left them their liberty, which they preserved until 25 B.C., when, without any renewal of war, Galatia was reduced into a Roman province. Four hundred years later, St. Jerome found in the districts round Ancyra the language which in his youth he had heard spoken on the banks of the Moselle and Rhine. These persistent seekers of adventure, who were supposed so easily to forget their native land on their wanderings, and to be so ready to adopt foreign manners, yet preserved with pious care their customs and their mother tongue.

It is doubtful whether to-day any trace of these ancient Celtic emigrations can be discovered in the Danube valley and in Asia Minor, lands which have been so often ravaged. But in upper Italy, which has been equally occupied by many different races, the Gallic origin of part of the population is revealed by types of countenance and by dialect. So also to-day, in the midst

of English rule on the banks of the St. Lawrence, and in the heart of some valleys at the Cape of Good Hope, may be heard the language carried from the banks of the Seine and Loire by the colonists of Henry IV. and Colbert, and by those who fled owing to the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. This volatile race, it has been said, has preserved its identity in a foreign land with as much success as the Bretons have preserved their peculiar characteristics in France.

CHAPTER III

CONQUEST OF GAUL BY THE ROMANS (125 B.C.–50 B.C.)

Formation of the Province of Narbonne (125). — Rome did not attempt to attack the Gauls until she had reduced their colonies in northern Italy and Asia Minor. Her dominion already extended to Mount Taurus, she held a province in Africa and had occupied Spain, while she still did not possess an inch of that Gallic territory which lay at her very doors. It was, however, necessary at all costs to secure the land route from Italy to Spain, and the Greeks of Marseilles, whom fear and hatred for Carthage had long since brought into alliance with Rome, supplied her with the needed opportunity. That rich and industrious city had filled all the Mediterranean coast of Gaul with its trading stations; its encroachments provoked an attack by the neighbouring Gallic tribes, and it at once appealed to the senate. A Roman army defeated the Ligurians and transferred their land to the Massiliots (154). New complaints brought the legions again into the territory of the Salyes, who were defeated (125), and on this occasion Rome retained her conquests, forming a new province between the Rhône and the Alps. Sextius founded near some hot springs the town of Aix (Aquae Sextii) as its capital. The Aedui, who held the land between the Saône and the Loire (Burgundy), presently sought alliance with Rome; the Allobroges (Savoy and Dauphiné), on the other hand, being nearer neighbours of the new province, attacked it, and 20,000 barbarians were left on the field of battle (121). Next year, the Romans in their turn crossed the Isère, and Bituit, King of the Averni, fell upon their rearguard with a force of 200,000 Gauls. When the barbarian chief, seated on his silver chariot and surrounded by his bodyguard, saw the small numbers of the legionaries, he declared that they would be no

more than a feast for his dogs, but Roman discipline and tactics, and the terror inspired by the elephants, secured the defeat of the barbarian host. Some time afterwards, Bituit was enticed to a conference, seized, loaded with chains, and taken to Rome. The whole district watered by the Rhône, as far as the lake of Geneva, was formed into a province, which in subsequent years was extended to the Pyrenees. The Volcae and Tectosages, who held Toulouse, accepted the position of federati, and the colony of Narbo Martius (Narbonne) was established to watch over these new subjects. Its position near the mouth of the Aube soon made it the rival of Marseilles (118).

This transalpine province, protected by the two colonies of Aix and Narbonne, and by the Tectosages and Aedui, newly allied with Rome, formed an advanced post, from which the senate was able to hold in check and to control the tribes of Gaul.

The Cimbri and Teutones (110): Battle of Aix (102).—The invasion of the Cimbri and Teutones threatened to destroy this recent dominion ; three hundred thousand of these barbarians, prevented from passing beyond the shores of the Baltic, spread like a flood over Gaul, and having reached the banks of the Rhône, there overthrew in succession five Roman armies. But instead of crossing the Alps, they crossed the Pyrenees and expended their time and energy in a struggle with the warlike Celtiberians. This was the salvation of Rome. It gained time in which to send Marius to defend the Gallic province. The general encamped on the left bank of the Rhône, and in order to ensure the arrival of supplies which could not reach him when the fords of the river were impracticable, he constructed from the sea to the river a canal which allowed the ships of Marseilles and Italy to avoid the dangerous mouths of the Rhône. They were jestingly nicknamed "Marius' mullets." But in this laborious employment, the legionaries recovered their energy and their discipline and regained that confidence which habits of luxury had sapped, so that when the barbarians reappeared, Marius had no hesitation in measuring his strength with theirs.

It was near Aix that Marius met the barbarian horde. He had fixed his camp on a waterless hill. When his soldiers complained of thirst, he pointed to a stream which washed the camp of the barbarians, crying, "There you may buy water with your blood." But the camp followers, having water neither for themselves nor for their beasts, crowded to the stream; the barbarians, imagining that they were about to be attacked, rushed to arms,

and striking their shields rhythmically, advanced to the sound of this wild music. In passing the stream, however, they broke their ranks, nor had they time to regain their order before the Romans fell upon them from their position of vantage, and charged them with such vigour that after enormous slaughter they were compelled to take to flight. When they reached their waggons, they met a new and unexpected enemy ; their women assaulted alike pursuers and pursued, hurling themselves into the midst of the combatants, and with bare hands attempting to seize the swords and shields of their enemies.

After this initial success, the Romans regained their positions as night fell, but their camp did not resound, as might have been expected after so great a success, with songs of joy and victory. The legionaries passed all the night in anxiety and fear, since they were protected neither by trenches nor earthworks. There still remained a great number of barbarians who had not been engaged, and who throughout the night gave vent to horrible yells, mingled with shouts of defiance and lamentations, like the howling of wild beasts. The shouts of this vast multitude caused the mountains to re-echo and struck terror into the Romans ; Marius himself, filled with amazement, anticipated a night attack and trembled for the result of a disorderly combat. But the barbarians did not stir from their position either on that night or on the following day ; they were occupied in preparing for battle.

This second battle, which occurred two days after the first, was not more fortunate for the barbarians. The main body of the Roman army delivered a frontal attack, while a lieutenant of Marius fell upon the rear of the barbarians, who were unable to resist. A horrible massacre occurred, as was usual in these battles of antiquity when men fought at close quarters, hand to hand. Plutarch records that the corpses rotted away in the plain by the rains which fell that winter, and so enriched the soil that in the next summer it displayed an amazing fertility ; that the Massiliots were able to fence their vineyards with the bones with which the plain was strewed (102).

The Suevi and Helvetii: Caesar in Gaul (58).—Rome might no doubt have taken advantage of the victories of Marius to extend her control over Gaul, where, during the very period of the invasion of the Cimbri, she had annexed the rich city of Toulouse. But civil disturbances soon desolated Italy and for forty years paralysed the strength of the Republic. The opportunity which Rome neglected, a German people attempted to

seize. The Suevi followed the route which the Cimbri had pursued, and 120,000 warriors, the advance guard of that great people, penetrated under the command of Ariovistus into the valley of the Saône. The Aedui and Sequani (Burgundy and Franche Comté) implored the protection of Rome against them. At the same time, the Helvetii (Switzerland), incessantly harassed by the Germans, attempted to leave their land, cross Gaul, and establish themselves on the shore of the ocean. Rome had then as consul Julius Caesar, one of the most brilliant geniuses the world has ever known. He desired to overthrow the existing government of his country, and to establish his own power on its ruins, but he lacked wealth with which to bribe the people and military glory with which to win over the soldiers. He therefore caused himself to be nominated governor of the province of Narbonne, with a commission to check the Helvetii and to expel the Suevi.

First Campaign (58): Reduction of the Saône Valley.—Caesar turned first to the Helvetii, whom he checked by a great battle on the banks of the Saône and forced to return to their own country. Having finished this first undertaking, he found himself opposed to Ariovistus. He suggested an interview. "If I have need of Caesar," answered Ariovistus, "I will go to him; if he has need of me, let him come to me." The proconsul resorted to threats: "No one," said the barbarian, "has yet attacked me without repenting. When Caesar so desires, we will measure our strength against each other, and he will learn what manner of warriors are those who for fourteen years have not slept beneath a roof." The soldiers of Caesar were terrified by the accounts which the natives gave of the height and indomitable courage of the Germans, but they advanced against them and in a bloody battle put them to flight. Ariovistus, wounded, recrossed the river with some of his men, and at this news, which spread joy throughout Gaul, the remainder of the Suevi retired to their forests. Two formidable wars had been concluded in a single compaign.

Second and Third Campaigns: Conquest of Belgian Gaul (57) and of Armorica and Aquitaine (56).—The Belgians, disturbed by the near approach of the legions, took up arms, and in the spring Caesar met on the banks of the Aisne 300,000 of these barbarians, who were reputed to be the bravest of the Gauls. A feint attack led the Bellovaci (Beauvais) to hasten to the defence of their homes; other tribes followed this fatal example, and Caesar had only to charge with his cavalry to convert a

retreat into a disorderly rout. For a whole day the Romans slaughtered their enemies without hindrance (57).

The coalition being dissolved, it was necessary to subdue the various tribes in detail. The Suessiones, Bellovaci, and Ambiani (Soissons, Beauvais, Amiens) did not resist, but the Nervii (Hainault) awaited the legions behind the Sambre and were annihilated. The whole Nervian host was slain; "Of our six hundred senators," the old man told Caesar, "three survive; of sixty thousand warriors, five hundred have escaped." This battle, in which Caesar fought not only for victory but for life, placed Belgic Gaul at his feet; only the Aduatici (between Namur and Liège) still remained in arms; their chief city was taken by storm, 53,000 of the tribe being sold into slavery. During this expedition, the younger Crassus, detached with one legion, overran the land between the Seine and the Loire, without meeting any resistance, and at the end of the second campaign Gaul appeared to be subdued.

Caesar was in Illyria when he learned that one of his legions had been cut up in the Valais and that all Armorica (Brittany) had risen. He returned hastily and himself fell upon the Veneti (Morbihan) who, relying on their two hundred vessels, accepted a naval battle in which their fleet was annihilated. This disaster, in which the flower of their nation fell, secured peace. At the same time, Salinus, in the north, dispersed the army of the Aulerci (le Mans), Eburones (Evreux), Unelli (St. Lo), and Lexovii (Lisieux). In the south, Crassus penetrated as far as the Garonne without meeting any opposition, crossed that river, and having defeated an army of 50,000 men, received the submission of almost all Aquitaine. This year the whole of Gaul, from the Pyrenees to the North Sea, had seen the victorious legions (56).

Fourth and Fifth Campaigns: Expeditions beyond the Rhine and to Britain (55–54): Isolated Revolts in Gaul (54–53).—But during the winter, 450,000 of the Usipii and Teutoni crossed the Rhine. Despite the snows, Caesar hastily repassed the Alps; the Germans, deceived by a truce, were surprised, and their host, caught in the tongue of land formed by the junction of the Rhine and Meuse, was almost annihilated. This invasion, and the help which in the previous year the Armoricans had received from the island of Britain, convinced Caesar that if his conquests were to be secure, Gaul must be isolated from Britain and Germany. He accordingly crossed the Rhine, struck terror into the neighbouring tribes, and, returning, struck a blow at Britain.

His disembarkation was difficult, but his army landed after a battle in the waves. It was, however, the season of the full moon; the tide, aided by a violent storm, dispersed a squadron which was bringing Caesar his cavalry and injured his transports. He hastened to attack the islanders, in order that he might speedily return with honour to the continent. "The enemy vanished," said an old chronicler, "as the snow on the seashore disappears before the south wind." This retreat was too much in the nature of a flight for Caesar not to repeat his expedition. In the following year he again appeared in Britain, and on this occasion he compelled the Britons to deliver hostages to him, and to promise an annual tribute.

Ambiorix.—In his first campaign Caesar had driven the Helvetii back to their mountains and the Suevi across the Rhine; he had subdued the east of Gaul. In his second campaign, the north had been conquered; in his third, the west; while in his fourth he had shown the Gauls by his two expeditions into Britain and Germany that they had nothing to hope from their neighbours. In his fifth, he endeavoured to emphasise this lesson by bearing his victorious eagles a second time into Britain. The Gallic war was then regarded as finished; it had not really begun. Hitherto four peoples had fought against the Romans independently: they were now to rise simultaneously.

Caesar, to hold them in subjection, called to his help that profound experience upon which Roman generals based their power. More especially he had favoured the exaltation of some ambitious chieftains, who handed over to him independent cities, in which a Roman party was formed to dominate the public assembly and the senate, to impede their action and betray their counsels. A further means of influence, which he had seized with ability, was to hold estates of the Gauls, in which deputies of all the tribes annually assembled. The most profound peace appeared to reign. This deceptive calm, and the apparent submissiveness of the Gallic chiefs in the estates which he held at Samarobriva, among the Ambiani, filled him with a sense of complete security, and since a drought had produced a scarcity of provisions, he scattered his eight legions over a space of more than a hundred leagues.

There was, however, a vast plot in existence, the soul of which was Ambiorix, a chief of the Eburones, and Indutiomar the Treveran. It was proposed to take up arms as soon as Caesar had left for Italy, to call in the help of the Germans, and to harass the legions in their quarters by cutting completely their

lines of communication. The secret was well kept, but a premature movement amongt the Carnutes kept Caesar in Gaul. Ambiorix, who believed that he had already crossed the Alps, revealed his hand by massacring a whole legion and by attacking a camp of Q. Cicero. At the same time, Indutiomar, among the Treveri, roused the people and threatened the camp of Labienus. North and east of the Loire the revolt became general; only the Aedui and Remi proved traitors to the national cause.

Despite his watchfulness Caesar was surprised. Twelve days had passed since the destruction of one of his legions. One of his lieutenants, Q. Cicero, had been besieged for a week, and not a single messenger had been able to reach his headquarters at Samarobriva (Amiens). At last a Gallic slave made his way through and informed the proconsul of the straits to which his lieutenant was reduced. Caesar had at hand only 7000 men; the besiegers numbered 60,000. But he assumed the offensive and relieved the camp of Cicero, in which only one soldier out of every ten was unwounded. Labienus was equally successful against the Treveri (Treves), and killed Indutiomar. But Ambiorix, though hunted like a wild beast, and chased from hiding place to hiding place, escaped. His people, the Eburones (Limburg), paid for him by suffering extermination.

Sixth Campaign: General Revolt under Vercingetorix (52).—These severities increased the hatred of the Romans, and during the winter, which Caesar spent in Italy, a new revolt was organised. That the union might be indissoluble, military standards were taken to a lonely spot, and on them the deputies of all the allied tribes swore to take up arms as soon as the signal was given. The revolt began with the Carnutes (Chartres). All the Roman inhabitants of Genabum (Orleans), a great trading city on the Loire, were murdered; on the same day news was carried by couriers distributed along the roads to Gergovia (near Clermont), one hundred and fifty miles away. There lived a young Arvernian noble, Vercingetorix, whose father had once attempted to usurp the throne. As soon as he heard of the massacre of Genabum, he raised his people, was invested with the command, and displaying that energy which circumstances demanded, summoned a meeting of a supreme council of the cities of Gaul. From the Garonne to the Seine, all the tribes answered his appeal; the conduct of the war was conferred upon him, with the result that the Arverni, and central Gaul, which had hitherto remained apart from the struggle, now took the first place.

Vercingetorix pushed on his preparations with vigour, and gave the confederacy a degree of organisation which had been wanting in all the previous attempts of the Gauls. His plan of attack was ably conceived. One of his lieutenants, Lucter, went southwards to invade the province of Narbonne, while he himself went northward against the legions. But he paused on the way to raise the Bituriges, subjects of the Aedui, and this delay gave Caesar time to arrive from Italy. In a few days he organised the defence of the province, expelled the enemy, crossed the Cevennes through six feet of snow, and carried desolation through the territory of the Arverni. Then recrossing the mountains, he reached the Rhône and Saône by forced marches, crossed, without being discovered, the whole district of the Aedui, and appeared in the midst of his legions. The daring and extraordinary activity of the proconsul served to disorganise the plans of the Gallic chief.

The first efforts of Caesar were directed against Genabum, where a violent night attack on the legions was repulsed and the attacking force either slain or taken prisoners. Caesar passed the Loire by the bridge of Genabum and captured the first town of the Bituriges to which he came, Noviodunum (Nouan or Neuvi-sur-Baranjon). Vercingetorix, hastening to save it, saw its fall, and realised that against such an opponent another type of warfare must be adopted. In a single day, the Bituriges burned twenty of their own towns, and this heroic resolution was imitated by the other tribes. The aim was to starve the enemy, but the plan was not fully adopted. Avaricum (Bourges), the capital of the country, was spared, and Caesar at once hastened to it. In twenty-five days, towers from which an attack might be delivered were built, as well as a great terrace three hundred feet long and eighty high. Caesar records that, in an attempt to destroy his siege works, a Gaul, stationed before the gates, hurled on to a burning tower a ball of tallow and pitch in order to encourage the flames. Struck by an arrow hurled from a "scorpion" he fell; another took his place, a third followed when the second was also mortally wounded, and then a fourth, so that during the whole battle this fatal post was never for an instant vacant. But the town was taken, and of the 40,000 soldiers or inhabitants who guarded it, scarcely 800 escaped.

The provisions which Caesar found in Avaricum supplied him for the rest of the winter. When spring arrived, he despatched Labienus with four legions against the Senones (Sens) and the Parisii (Paris), while he himself led the remainder of his

army against the Arverni. But Vercingetorix covered Gergovia; an attack upon it failed, forty-six centurions fell, and Caesar decided to rejoin Labienus. His march partook of the nature of a flight; the Aedui, believing that he could not retrieve his position, massacred his recruits and the Italian merchants in all their cities. This defection placed the army in a position of such peril that many advised the proconsul to retire into Narbonensis. But if he had been vanquished in Gaul, he would have been proscribed at Rome; he accordingly abandoned any such idea and boldly fell upon the north, leaving 100,000 Gauls between himself and Narbonne.

The chief of the Auleroi, Camulogenus, was at the head of the northern confederates, an able and active veteran, who had his headquarters at Lutetia (Paris). That town was then built entirely on an island in the Seine, was defended towards the south by the marsh of Bièvre. When Labienus attempted to attack it from this side, he was not even able to approach the place. He retired towards *Melodunum* (Melun), seized all the vessels which he found on the river, captured the town, and advanced by the other bank against Lutetia. Camulogenus, fearing that the place would be stormed, burned the town and the bridges, and retired to the heights on the left bank. He knew that the Bellovaci had taken up arms in the rear of Labienus, and he wished to force that general to accept battle, with a great river behind him and enveloped by two armies. But Labienus escaped his vigilance and passed the Seine at a point at which Camulogenus could only oppose him with a third of his forces. The old chief attempted to drive the Romans back into the river; a bloody battle followed, and the Gallic leader perished with almost all his warriors. By this success Labienus only secured his retreat; he hastened to reach the territory of the Senones, in which Caesar had already arrived.

A new assembly of all the deputies of Gaul confirmed Vercingetorix in the supreme command. Three tribes alone were unrepresented, the Ligones (Langres), the Remi (Reims), and the Treveri (Treves). With their help, Caesar, who lacked cavalry, took into his pay several bands of Germans, whom he mounted on the horses of his military tribunes and knights. He met Vercingetorix not far from the Saône. The Gallic cavalry had sworn that they would not see their wives and children again until they had at least twice crossed the Roman lines. Caesar exposed himself to great personal dangers, and even left his sword in the hands of the enemy, but his legions resisted this

furious onslaught bravely, and pursuing the enemy in their turn, drove them in disorder to the very walls of Alesia.

Siege of Alesia (52).—Alesia (Alise on the Côte D'or or, more probably, Alaise, twelve kilometres north of Salins) was built on the summit of a rugged hill, and was held to be one of the strongholds of Gaul. Before its walls, on the sides of the hill, Vercingetorix had established a camp for his army, which still numbered 80,000 infantry and 10,000 cavalry. Caesar formed the bold design of ending the war in a single blow by besieging the town and the army simultaneously. Vast siege works were begun. A first ditch, twenty-nine feet broad and 11,000 long, was dug: behind this was a second ditch fifteen feet deep, and finally a third into which a stream was diverted. The last was protected by an entrenchment twelve feet in height, surmounted with battlements, palisaded for its whole circumference with forked trees, and flanked by towers eighty paces from each other. Before the ditch were placed five rows of *chevaux de frise* and eight lines of stakes fixed in the earth, their points concealed under branches, while nearer the enemy's camp he placed pitfalls filled with sharp thorns. All these works were duplicated on the side of the plain, where the lines of circumvallation reached a circuit of sixteen miles. Five weeks' labour by less than 60,000 men sufficed for this task.

Before the lines were completed, Vercingetorix sent away his cavalry which had become useless and which he could not keep supplied, promising to hold out for thirty days, but urging the tribes of Gaul to rise *en masse*. His appeal was heard; 248,000 picked warriors gathered from all parts of Gaul to relieve their compatriots, and broke themselves against the impregnable rampart of the legions. After having repulsed several vain assaults, Caesar assumed the offensive, defeated the Gauls, cut their rearguard in pieces, and spread through their ranks a terror which served to disperse them. This time Gaul was conquered, and for ever.

The garrison of Alesia was forced to surrender at discretion. Vercingetorix gave himself up in the hope that he might thus secure more lenient treatment for his followers from the proconsul. Mounted on his charger and wearing his richest armour, he came out of the city alone, galloped to the tribunal of Caesar, and jumping from his horse, cast his helmet and sword at the feet of the Roman, who remained unmoved and stern. The lictors seized him, and Caesar caused him to wait six years for his conqueror's triumph and his own death.

Seventh Campaign: Last Revolts (51): Measures Adopted for the Pacification of Gaul (50).—But Caesar did not dare to winter beyond the Alps ; he was obliged to watch the Gauls of the north and west, who had taken but a small part in the last struggle, and who were secretly arming. In the midst of winter he fell on the Bituriges (Bourges), and carrying fire and sword through their land, compelled the population to fly into the neighbouring districts. The Carnutes (Chartres), who rose again, were severely chastised. The Bellovaci (Beauvais) rose *en masse ;* the proconsul defeated their best infantry at a river crossing and obliged them to implore his mercy ; they and all the towns of the north-east handed over hostages. Caesar entered Belgica, and once more drove Ambiorix across the Rhine ; he then returned, demanded hostages from the Armorican towns, and stifled the revolt between the Loire and Garonne. In a short time the war was confined to the Cadurci (Cahors) at Uxellodunum (Cap de Nac) ; this town was cut off from water and compelled to surrender. Caesar, who would have been ruined by a prolonged war of this kind, resolved to make a terrible example ; he caused the hands of all those who were found in Uxellodunum to be cut off.

This barbarous punishment was the last act of the terrible conflict which decided that the Gauls should not be left free to develop their own national existence. Their civilisation was of a higher order than ordinary accounts suggest, and while it is impossible to say what that civilisation left to itself would have become, it is always permissible to honour a heroic resistance, and to lament the premature overthrow of a great people.

For Rome, the Gallic war was the glorious conclusion of the conquests of the Republic. Caesar had spent eight years on this task ; he had employed ten legions, and the inexhaustible resources of Roman discipline, of his own military genius, and of his unsurpassed activity. Having subdued Gaul by his arms, he spent a whole year (50) in winning her affection and in leading her to forget her defeat. No confiscations took place, no heavy burdens were imposed ; there was a complete absence of those violent and irritating measures which had marked the conduct of so many proconsuls. Gaul was made a province ; but her cities retained their laws and government, and the only sign of the conquest was a tribute of forty million sesterces (7,794,000 francs).

SECOND PERIOD—GAUL UNDER THE ROMANS

(50 B.C.–A.D. 476)

CHAPTER IV

GAUL UNDER THE EMPIRE (50 B.C.–A.D. 395)

Organisation of Gaul by Augustus: Four Provinces, Sixty Cities.—The conquest of Gaul gave Caesar an army experienced in war and devoted to its general, a great reputation, and vast riches. By his victories he won the hearts of those whom he could not bribe; all others he overcame by force of arms, but the civil war and his premature death prevented him from giving his attention to Gaul. Augustus himself was unable to visit the province until he had made himself sole master of the Roman world. Then (27 B.C.) he went to Gaul, and in order to destroy the old tribal organisation, and to obliterate the memory of the past, he altered the boundaries of the provinces and renamed several cities. Aquitaine, which had previously been confined between the Pyrenees and the Garonne, was extended to the Loire. Celtic Gaul, under the name of Lugdunensis, was reduced to the district contained between the Loire, Seine, and Marne. The remainder of the province formed Belgica.

Numerous Roman colonies were established in Gaul in order to strengthen Latin influences. In Narbonensis, Fréjus became one of the great arsenals of the empire, and Arles so grew in size as to be called "the Rome of Gaul." Gergovia, which had witnessed the flight of Caesar, was deprived of its position as capital of the Arverni, which was transferred to a neighbouring village, *Augusto-Nemetum* (Clermont). The city of Bratuspantium was similarly reduced in rank for the benefit of *Caesaromagus* (Beauvais). The name of *Augusta* was added to the capitals of the Suessiones (Soissons), Veromandui (Saint Quentin), Tricasses (Troyes), Rauraci (Augst), Auskes (Auch), and Treveri (Treves). The town of the Turones became *Caesarodunum* (Tours); that of the Lemovici, *Augustoritum* (Limoges), and

Bibracte became famous throughout the whole empire under the name of *Augustodunum* (Autun).

Privileges were also unequally distributed. The Aedui (Burgundy) and Remi (Champagne) preserved the title of allies, which was also granted to the Carnutes, so that in the south, west, and north there were three powerful tribes interested in the maintenance of the new social order. The Santones (Saintes), Arverni (Auvergne), the Bituriges (Berry), liberated dependants of the Aedui, and Suessiones (Soissons) preserved their own laws. Gaul was divided into sixty municipalities, and the number of Gallic tribes recognised as forming the nation was reduced to this number. This dual measure greatly assisted the maintenance of order and the administration of the country, since each of the sixty cities was held responsible for disorders occurring in its territory. To supply them with a model upon which they might organise themselves, Augustus gave them an entirely Roman capital in Lugdunum (Lyons), at the junction of the Rhône and Saône, which became the centre of imperial administration in Gaul. Agrippa built from it his four military roads, leading to the Atlantic, the Rhine, the Channel, and alone the Rhône and Mediterranean to the Pyrenees.

Druidism was still powerful in Gaul. Augustus attacked it skilfully, identifying all the gods of Gaul with those of the Roman pantheon, and building altars to them under double names, Bellen-Apollo, Mars-Camul, Diana-Arduinna. He also forbade human sacrifices and only conferred the rank of a city upon such as would abandon the druidical ruins. These efforts were successful, and no province was so rapidly romanised.

Reorganisation of the Fourth Century: Seventeen Provinces, 120 Cities.—The original organisation of Gaul by Augustus was modified in the fourth century. A prefecture of the Gauls, with its seat at Treves, created and included the three dioceses of Spain, Britain, and Gaul, the last of which was subdivided into seventeen provinces, subdivided in their turn into one hundred and twenty cities. The prefect, the vicar of the diocese, and the seventeen proconsuls or governors of provinces held only civil authority; military power was committed to the counts and dukes, who resided generally on the frontiers.

Each city controlled the villages of its territory, which was often so large as to be exactly represented in many cases by the provinces of the old French monarchy. Touraine, Périgord, Poitou, Quercy, and Berry were only the former territories of Tours, Périgueux, Poitiers, Cahors, and Bourges. In each city

there was an hereditary senate, a *curia* or assembly of proprietors (possessed of at least twenty-five *arpents*[1]), and municipal officers, generally elected by the *curia*, who superintended the affairs of the town and its territory, under the supervision of the governor of the province, who was at first directly responsible to the emperor, and at a later date to the president or vicar of the diocese. This governor did not intervene in the internal affairs of the city, his relations with it being confined to judicial and financial matters. He revised on appeal sentences given by the municipal senates; he received the taxes, and decided the quota due from each; the division and collection of the imposts was made by the *curias* on their own responsibility. Sometimes the deputies of all the towns and even of all the provinces met together, but unfortunately these assemblies, which might have acquainted the central government with the real interests of the provinces, had no regular sessions and fell into desuetude. In 365, Valentinian introduced an important innovation into the municipal system. He established the *defensor civitatis*, a species of tribune of the people, charged with the defence of their interests against imperial officials, the treasury, and oppression of every kind; he was to be chosen from without the order of the *curiales*, the municipal aristocracy. This office was soon almost everywhere confided to the bishops and was the source of their influence over the cities.

Roman Civilisation in Gaul: Schools, Arts, Industry, and Commerce.—The Gauls, condemned to a life of tranquillity, employed in the arts of peace that energy which they had displayed in the arts of war. The druidical forests fell under their axes, or were pierced by roads along which commerce and civilisation flowed. Cities increased, Greek art was introduced, and the Venus found in the ruins of Arles, the Jupiter found in those of Aix, rival the finest statues of antiquity. Triumphal arches, temples, arenas, theatres, and aqueducts arose, nor were they always the work of foreigners. Orange still preserves the fairest triumphal arch which the Romans have left us; Vienne has the temple of Augustus and Livia. Nimes possesses its arenas, which are not the largest extant Roman amphitheatres, but which are the best preserved; its *Maison Carrée*, a beautiful monument which Colbert wished to remove to Versailles and Napoleon to Paris, where it has been more or less copied, since

[1] An old French measure of land which varied from 54,900 sq. feet (royal arpent) to 45,425 sq. feet (common arpent), thus consisting of about one acre and a quarter.

the church of the Madeleine has been built according to its proportions on a larger scale, and finally at some distance the *Pont du Gard*. This vast structure which cuts across the wild valley of Gardon at a height of forty-eight metres is merely part of a vast aqueduct which that rich and pleasure-loving city built to bring to it across ten leagues of mountains and valleys the pure and cool waters of the Cevennes. At the same time, the schools of Bordeaux, Autun, Lyons, and Vienne rivalled those of Greece, and conquered Gaul gave to the masters of the world grammarians, orators, and poets. From her came Valarius Cato, surnamed the Latin siren; Cornelius Gallus, of Fréjus, an elegiac poet, the friend of Virgil and Augustus; Trogus Pompeius, of the land of the Vocontu, the first Latin author of a universal history, an abridgment of which has been preserved for us by Justin; Domitius Afer, the master of Quintilian, by whom he was declared to be the most eloquent orator that he had heard, but whose genius was degraded by his servility. Petronius also sullied the Latin muses by his *Satyricon*, an immoral picture of a profoundly degraded society. Marcus Aper has the honour of being the author of a work which has been attributed to Tacitus. Favorinus of Arles, the celebrated sophist, the friend of Plutarch and of the emperor Hadrian, amazed himself by speaking Greek so well despite his Gallic birth. In the fourth century there flourished Ausonius of Bordeaux, an amiable poet; in the fifth, Rutilius Numantianus, who wrote an itinerary of Rome in verse, and Sidonius Apollinaris, who was at once a poet and a bishop.

Commerce and industry developed more rapidly than the arts and letters. In the time of Augustus, the most flourishing cities of Gaul were found where that land bordered on Italy; by the second century, industrial activity had spread over the land and wealth abounded everywhere. Toulouse eclipsed Narbonne; Nimes, so lavishly endowed by the Antonines with splendid monuments, surpassed the ancient Phocaean city, which had abandoned its stern manners and gave occasion for the proverb, addressed to such as forgot all in the pursuit of pleasure, "You are going to Marseilles." Lyons, the ancient capital, watched the growth of a rival in the city of the Treveri, the chief defence of Gaul against the Germans. Mainz, Cologne, and twenty other cities rose on the banks of the Rhine to protect its passage. Vienne, Autun, and Reims with their schools; Lutetia, which, thanks to its situation, equidistant from Germany and Britain, became the residence of the Caesars

charged with the defence of the two frontiers; Langres and Saintes with their manufactures of *caracallas*, a kind of woollen cloak, which were exported to the whole of Italy; Bordeaux, the chief port for Spain and Brittany; all these serve to exhibit a life which was as vigorous in the centre as on the borders of the land, on the Rhine and Atlantic as on the shores of the Mediterranean.

The language, laws, and arts of Rome took possession of Gaul, but with them came also Roman manners, gross and sensual pleasures, a love of bloody spectacles and of fights between beasts, gladiatorial shows, and appalling moral corruption. Yet Gallic nationality was not entirely stifled under this foreign civilisation. The old Celtic tongue existed, especially in the west in Armorica, in the north in Belgica, on the banks of the Moselle, and even in the centre among the Arverni, where in the fifth century the majority of the nobles still spoke the language of their ancestors. If the language lived, ancient customs were equally preserved. Even druidism, though persecuted by the emperors, did not entirely disappear. Scattered relics of the old creed were long found in the remoter districts, where it may be traced in various superstitions, such as the worship of stones, fountains, fairies, genii, and the like.

Christianity in Gaul.—Augustus had attacked druidism which had been so intimately connected with the struggle for independence. Claudius proscribed the druids, abolished their religion, and imposed the death penalty on those who practised the cult, though this did not prevent the religion from lasting for centuries longer. Its great opponent was Christianity. As early as the second century there were Christians beyond the Alps; Lyons was the chief church of the Gauls, and there the first martyrs suffered.

Towards the middle of the second century some priests of Smyrna, having at their head Potinus, a disciple of St. Polycarp, who had in his youth heard the apostle St. John, arrived in Gaul. Potinus in a few years won a numerous community for the faith and defended with reputation the orthodox faith against heresy. At this time, Marcus Aurelius published an edict against the Christians, and persecution soon began at Lyons. The faithful were brought before the governor and condemned to torture: some, overcome by pain, consented to burn incense before the idols, but the majority faced martyrdom unmoved. Potinus at the age of ninety was stoned by the people. Forty-seven confessors perished in the jaws of the lions or were executed; a woman and a child, Blandine and Ponticus,

before descending into the amphitheatre, satiated the fury of the hangmen (177).

The church of Lyons, momentarily dispersed, was revived by St. Irenaeus, whose knowledge and genius won for him the title of the "Lamp of the West," the "Hatchet of Heresy." He suffered in the persecution ordered by Septimus Severus (212). But the word of Christ had not yet been carried into the rest of Gaul. About A.D. 250, seven bishops set out from Rome to effect this conquest. Paul, Trophimus, and Saturninus in a measure took possession of southern Gaul, establishing themselves at Narbonne, Arles, and Toulouse. Two others, Martial and Gatian, went westwards to Limoges and Tours; one Stremonius, laboured in the rugged mountains of Auvergne; another, St. Denis, on the banks of the Seine at Lutetia. But persecution interrupted their pious work. Saturninus was handed over at Toulouse to the rage of a mad bull. Denis was beheaded on the mountain of Mars (Montmartre) near Lutetia, and buried by the care of a pious woman in the plain which bears his name (St. Denis). The disciples whom they left behind displayed the same zeal and endured like sufferings; at Chartres the first missionaries who came to convert the district were hurled into the wells; at Troyes the confessor Patroclus expired in red-hot chains; at Metz, Clement was forced to make his home and his church in the underground passages of the amphitheatre, and was disturbed when he preached by the roaring of the beasts destined to devour the Christians. Danger redoubled fervour and devotion. Noblemen, sons of senators, such as Quentinus, Crespinus, and Crespinianus, embraced degraded occupations in order that they might have free access to all classes and spread with vigour the Christian creed. A century later, St. Martin resumed and completed the work of St. Denis in the districts of the north.

But already Christianity had ascended the imperial throne with Constantine. In that great revolution, Gaul played a glorious part. She had already had the honour in the second century of defending orthodoxy with energy under St. Irenaeus; the same honour fell to her in the fourth century under St. Hilary, and through the support of the churches of Gaul and Africa the unity of Christianity was maintained against the eastern heresies.

Thanks to the Edict of Constantine, which permitted churches to receive gifts, the temporal power of the clergy grew with their spiritual power, and during the decadence of the empire,

the towns, ill protected by those who should have guarded them, gave to their bishops, under the title of *defensor civitatis*, the chief authority over them.

Political Events: Persecution of the Druids: Florus and Sacrovir.—As early as the reign of Tiberius, it was seen how well Gaul clung to the peace which she owed to the Romans. Julius Florus attempted to raise the Belgae, and Sacrovir to lead the tribes of Celtic Gaul to revolt (21). This rising caused some disquiet at Rome, but the isolation in which its leaders were left showed how slight was the ground for fear. Florus and Sacrovir committed suicide. Caligula exhibited his mad folly to Gaul, while Claudius, who was so severe against the druids, opened the senate to the natives of the province. There are still preserved at Lyons tables of brass on which may be read fragments of the oration which he delivered on this occasion. The revolt by which Nero was overthrown began on the banks of the Saône; the Aquitainian Vindex, governor of Lugdunensis, gave the signal to which all the provinces responded. The empire was violently disturbed, and in two years four emperors received the purple (68–70).

Civilis: Sabinus and Eponina.—As a result of these revolutions, the Batavian Civilis thought that the time had come to break the chain which Caesar had forged. The druids, emerging from their hiding-places in the depth of the woods, announced the fall of the Latin race and the ascendancy of the transalpine nations. A Gaul, Sabinus, assumed the title of emperor. But Vespasian was already at Rome; everything was reorganised under his capable hand; the legions returned to their duty, and Civilis, who had retired to the marshes of Batavia, sued for peace. Sabinus hid his ephemeral majesty in a cavern, where he lived nine years with his wife Eponina. At last he was discovered and brought to Rome, where Vespasian sent him to execution. In vain Eponina threw herself at his knees: "Caesar," she cried, showing him her children, "I conceived and nourished these children in the tombs in order that more suppliants might come to embrace your knees." Those who sat by wept: Vespasian himself gave way to tears, but he was inflexible. Then Eponina rising, demanded that she might share the fate of him whom she could not save. "I shall be happier with him in the shades and under the earth," she said, "than you are in the enjoyment of absolute power." Her prayer was granted; Plutarch met one of her children at Delphi.

The Gallic Caesars (267–273).—For more than a century after

this Gaul played no part in history. In 197 the Battle of Lyons decided the quarrel between Albinus and Septimus Severus, and during the following century the continual revolutions to which the Roman Empire was the prey emboldened the barbarians. Powerful confederacies were formed in Germany, by which the left bank of the Rhine was constantly assailed. In the universal disorder, Gaul remembered Civilus and Sabinus ; and for thirteen years was ruled by emperors of her own. The last of these, Tetricus, weary of power, betrayed his army and surrendered to Aurelian. No sooner had the barbarians heard of the death of that redoubtable prince than they hurled themselves on Gaul and sacked seventy cities. Probus, a second Aurelian, hastened to the province and drove the Germans back into their forests, but the north of Gaul was none the less covered with ruins.

Increasing Misery in the Fourth Century: The Bagaudae.—Under the scourge of these frequent incursions, and the oppressive fiscal system of the empire, that prosperity which the provinces had enjoyed for two centuries constantly declined. Unrest replaced security: commerce and industry were interrupted. Misery spread through the land, and its terrible progress was revealed in the time of Diocletian when the peasants rose under the name of Bagaudae. Maximinian was forced to wage a regular war against them ; he destroyed their entrenched camp near Paris, at the village of St. Maur-les-fossés.

Ravages of the Barbarians: Julian in Gaul.—Constantius Chlorus (or the Pale) governed Gaul mildly and attempted to heal its wounds. His son Constantine, before setting out to conquer Maxentius and Licinius, was careful to give the barbarians a severe lesson, the memory of which led them to keep the peace throughout his reign. Two Frankish chiefs whom he had taken prisoner were thrown to the beasts in the amphitheatre of Treves. But the barbarians were too well acquainted with the roads into Gaul not to enter the province when his restraining hand was withdrawn. Under Constantius II. they reappeared, and to rescue Belgica from the Franks and Alemanni that prince was obliged to send Julian to Gaul. The young Caesar delivered the province from these unwelcome guests. In 357 he defeated seven kings of the Alemanni near Strassburg, while 600 Frank warriors, whom he captured in a castle, after a siege of fifty-four days, were sent by him to Constantius, who enrolled them in his guard. At the same time Julian allowed one Frankish tribe, the Salians, to establish themselves on the banks of the lower Meuse. It was at the imperial palace of Lutetia, the

ruins of which still remain, that Julian was proclaimed emperor by his soldiers (360). He did not again visit Gaul, and after his death the empire was soon divided into the empires of the East and West.

Gaul included in the Share of Honorius (395).—Valentinian, who ruled in the West, and his son Gratian, inspired respect in the barbarians. But while they did not enter the empire as a nation, they invaded the legions as auxiliaries; they received offices and honours. They filled most positions, since, among the degenerate Romans, they preserved their courage, daring, and energy. One of them, Arbogast, a Frank, murdered Valentinian II. near Vienne, and created a puppet emperor, the rhetorician Eugenius (392). Theodosius the Great overthrew alike the protector and his protégé, and for some time reigned over all the provinces. But at his death the empire was finally divided, and Gaul fell to the share of Honorius (395).

CHAPTER V

INVASION OF THE BARBARIANS: THE FRANKS BEFORE CLOVIS (241–481)

Decline of the Empire.—The Roman Empire endured for four centuries, two in honour and prosperity, two in misery and shame. Four hundred years is a short life for an empire. But the emperors had destroyed the vigour of their subjects by a rule of terror, and their dispirited people regarded the threatened destruction of the empire and the approach of the barbarians with the same apathy and indifference as they had displayed in face of the establishment of despotism. At the end of the fourth century, courage and discipline had disappeared from the army, patriotism was unknown among citizens ruined by the constantly increasing exactions of a government which became daily less able to protect its subjects. Nor was Christianity able to check an appalling moral degradation; it even supplied an element which hastened the dissolution of the empire.

The Gauls, denied the use of arms for four hundred years, could no longer wield the sword, and the descendants of the terrible comrades of the *brenns* fled like frightened sheep at the approach of a handful of Germans. Ignorant of the art of defence, they were equally incapable of concerted action. Each man lived for his town, for himself. Lyons was indifferent to the

misfortunes of Treves, Bordeaux to those of Reims, with the result that when the thin line of soldiers guarding the Rhine frontier had been pierced, the barbarians overran the province with impunity. It is easy to imagine the situation when Italy, herself threatened, recalled to her assistance the remnants of her legions, and when the barrier of the Rhine was no longer guarded.

Origin of the Franks.—By the middle of the third century before Christ, the Germans appear to have established on the right bank of the Rhine two formidable confederacies. To the south was that of the Suevian tribes, who called themselves Alemanni (men); to the north of the Salians, Sicambrians, Bructeri, Cherusci, Catti, and other tribes, who took the name of Franks (heroes). The latter are first mentioned by Latin writers in A.D. 241, when the soldiers of Aurelian, then a legionary tribune, being summoned, after defeating a body of Franks, to march to the east against the Persians, sang :—

> Mille Francos, mille Sarmatas semel occidimus,
> Mille, mille, mille, mille Persos quaerimus.

Incursions of the Franks into Africa (256): Established on the Euxine by Probus (277).—In 256 a band of Franks overran Gaul, crossed the Pyrenees, ravaged Spain for twelve years, and finally vanished in Africa. Probus, having retaken the cities of Gaul which the Franks had seized after the death of Aurelian, transported a colony of that people to the Black Sea. But the barbarians soon wearied of this exile; they seized some ships, passed the Dardanelles, and navigated the Mediterranean, ravaging in turn the shores of Asia, Greece, and Africa as far as the pillars of Hercules. Then, having rounded the coast of Spain and Gaul, they rejoined their compatriots on the banks of the Rhine, telling them of the weakness of that great empire which they had traversed with impunity from end to end.

Invasion of Gaul and Establishment on the Meuse under Julian.—As their expeditions had extended so far, the Franks were not likely to refrain from the invasion of the Gallic provinces which lay near them on the left bank of the Rhine. As soon as the Romans relaxed their vigilance, they crossed the river and wasted Belgium. Julian defeated them, but finding that they utterly devastated the banks of the Meuse, he thought it better to abandon the district to them and allow them to repeople it. The Franks were thus the first barbarians to pass the Rhine, the first to be established in Gaul as auxiliaries and allies of the empire. They were the last to found a kingdom.

Arbogast the Frank (392).—Not only did the Franks establish themselves peacefully within the empire, but some of them also rose to the highest positions. When Theodosius, intervening on behalf of Valentinian II., had conquered the usurper Maximus, he gave to the young emperor, as his chief adviser, the Frank Arbogast, who had freed Gaul from the Germans and filled all civil and military posts with barbarians. Valentinian was unable long to endure such tutelage ; he determined to dismiss Arbogast from all his employments. But he declared in the presence of the whole court, " I hold my position from Theodosius, and he alone can dismiss me." Valentinian, in a great rage, fell upon him sword in hand ; some days later he himself was found dead in bed (May 15, 392). Arbogast could not hope that Theodosius would allow this murder to go unpunished, and not daring to proclaim himself emperor, gave the purple to one of his secretaries, the rhetorician Eugenius. The two tried to rally to them the remnants of the pagan party, thus alienating the Christians. A single battle, near Aquileia, sufficed to end their revolt ; Eugenius was taken prisoner and put to death by Theodosius ; Arbogast committed suicide (394).

The Great Invasion (406): Kingdoms of the Burgundians (413) and Visigoths (419).—But the great barbarian invasion followed. Towards the end of 406, while the legions were engaged in Italy against Radagasus, who had invaded the peninsula with 200,000 men, the Suevi, Vandals, and Alans approached the Rhine. The Franks established on the left bank attempted to bar their progress and killed 20,000 Vandals in a great battle. But the allies of the defeated party renewed the attack, the Franks were defeated, and on the last day of the same year the host crossed the river. After ravaging Gaul far and wide, the destroying flood swept over the Pyrenees and descended into Spain. But behind this first horde of barbarians, others hastened to the spoil. The Burgundians under their king Gondicar halted in the east, and Honorius, finding them more pacifically inclined than had been the earlier invaders, granted to them that which in actual fact he could not have prevented them from securing, all the land lying between Lake Geneva and the confluence of the Rhine and Moselle (413).

About the same time, the Visigoths whom Alaric had conducted into Italy from the banks of the Danube were led by his brother Athaulf into southern Gaul. That barbarian became as Roman as he could and attempted to repair the ruin which he had so greatly contributed to cause. He married Placidia,

sister of the Emperor Honorius, overthrew two usurpers who had assumed the purple in Gaul, and undertook for the benefit of the empire the recovery of Spain from the Suevi and Alans. But he was assassinated in Barcelona, and his less disinterested successor Wallia continued the war for his own profit. The Visigoths, lords of Aquitaine as far as the Loire and of the larger part of Spain, thus secured an empire which appeared destined to be permanent and of which Toulouse was the capital.

The Salian Franks: Legendary History of Clodion and Meroveus: Battle of Châlons.—At the time of the great invasion, the Franks had attempted to check the invaders. Having failed to do so, and the empire having abdicated its authority, they resolved to secure some share in the spoil, and shortly afterwards penetrated into the interior of Gaul. Tradition relates that in 428 the Salian Franks were ruled by a certain Clodion, who resided at Dispargum in the district of Tongres. His reputed predecessor, Pharamond, must be dismissed as a wholly mythical character; the accounts of Clodion himself are more than doubtful. He is said to have taken Tournai and Cambrai, killing all the Romans whom he found in those towns. Advancing westwards towards the Somme, he reached Hesdin, where the Franks encamped behind a ring of waggons on some low hills washed by a small stream. Supposing the Romans to be far away, they celebrated the marriage of one of their chiefs; their camp was a scene of festivity, no watch was kept, and on all sides the noise of songs and dances resounded, while within the circle of waggons arose the smoke of the great fires on which meat was being roasted. Suddenly Aëtius appeared. His soldiers advanced in column along a narrow causeway, crossed the stream by means of a temporary wooden bridge, and fell upon the barbarians before they had time to form. Behind the fighting line, the Franks hastily threw into their waggons the materials of their feast, dishes and huge tuns of beer decked with leaves. The barbarians were forced to give way and take to flight; their waggons, with the fair bride, fell into the hands of the conquerors. Clodion did not survive his defeat.

According to tradition, his relative Meroveus succeeded him as chief of the Salians. Three years later the Franks united with all the barbarians cantoned in Gaul and with the remnants of the legions to check the formidable invasion of the Huns.

That people had reached Europe seventy-five years before from the heart of central Asia and filled all men with fear and horror. In character and physique, in their manner of life, they were

entirely divorced from the peoples of the West. Their faces were bony, their eyes mere slits, their expression revolting. Their noses were flat and broad, their ears large and protruding, their complexion yellow, and their hair scanty. "Two legged wild beasts," Ammianus Marcellinus calls them. They crossed the vast Steppes in great waggons or mounted on their tireless ponies, living on the milk of their herds or on a small amount of flesh which they first caused to rot by binding it between their saddles and the sides of their horses.

Such were the men who hurled themselves upon Europe in the second half of the fourth century, throwing the whole barbarian world into confusion and driving it back upon the Roman Empire. When the Goths crossed the Danube, when the Vandals and Burgundians crossed the Rhine, they were alike flying before the Huns. That people halted in central Europe for fifty years and then resumed their march.

Their king, Attila, compelled all the tribes between the Urals and the Rhine to march with him. For a while, he hesitated as to which empire he would visit with the vengeance of Heaven; at last he decided to attack the West, and passing the Rhine, Moselle, and Seine, advanced upon Orleans. In indescribable terror the population fled before him, since, where the "Scourge of God" passed, no stone was left upon another. Metz and twenty other cities were destroyed; Troyes was saved only by its bishop, St. Lupus. Attila resolved to take Orleans, the key of the southern provinces, and a countless host surrounded that town. Its bishop, St. Anianus, maintained the courage of the inhabitants, promising them effective help, and Aëtius approached with all the barbarians already settled in Gaul, whose position was threatened by the Huns. For the first time Attila fell back, but in order that he might give battle where the ground favoured his cavalry, he halted on the Catalaunian Plains, between Méry-sur-Seine and Châlons-sur-Marne. Here a terrible conflict ensued. In a preliminary battle the Franks who formed the advanced guard of the army of Aëtius, and the Gepidae who formed the rearguard of that of Attila, fought with such vigour that 15,000 dead were left on the field. At the close of the battle itself, 165,000 combatants lay dead on the scene of carnage. Attila was defeated. He withdrew into a camp protected by a ring of all his waggons. In the morning, according to the Goth Jornandès, the historian of this war, the victors saw in the centre of the camp a huge pile formed of the saddles of horses, Attila stood upon it, torch in hand, his Huns around him, ready

to convert it into his funeral pyre if the defences were forced. He was a veritable lion, pursued to the entrance of his den by huntsmen, turning and causing them to halt in terror by his roar. The allies did not dare to risk the desperation of the Huns, and allowed Attila to withdraw into Germany. Next year he reasserted his strength by invading upper Italy; but on his return he died from the bursting of a blood vessel, and his empire fell with him, though the dread memory of his name and cruelty survived. The Visigoths, whose king fell in the battle, and the Franks, shared with Aëtius the chief glory of the memorable conflict of the Catalaunian Plains.

The Salian Franks under Childeric.—The mythical Meroveus was succeeded by his almost equally mythical son, Childeric. A story, preserved by Gregory of Tours, relates that the Franks, angered by Childeric's slothful luxury, deposed him and took as their chief a Roman general, Aegidius. Childeric found a refuge in Thuringia, leaving in his own land a faithful friend charged with the duty of conciliating his subjects and winning them back to their former allegiance. A token was arranged by which the king might know when he could return, a gold coin was divided in two, one half being kept by Childeric, the other by his friend. "When I send you my half, you may come back in safety," he said. Aegidius had reigned eight years when the faithful agent of Childeric, having secretly won back the affection of the Franks, sent messengers to his prince with the piece of gold which he had preserved. The king knew from this sign that the Franks desired his return; he left Thuringia and recovered his authority. Some time after, Basina, Queen of Thuringia, came to him, and when Childeric asked the reason which had led her to undertake a journey from so distant a land, she answered, "I knew your merit and your bravery, therefore have I come to you; had I known of any greater man beyond the seas I would have gone to him." Childeric married her, and a son was born who was named Clovis, "a great prince and a renowned warrior."

Childeric died in 481 and was buried at Tournai, where his alleged tomb was discovered in 1653. In it were found a ring, on which was engraved the head of a man with long hair, a stylus for writing, some bees of gold or rather some jewels which had been fastened on a mantle of red silk, the remains of which crumbled to dust in contact with the air, a globe of rock crystal, many Roman coins, and the iron head of an axe.

Chaos in Gaul.—The legendary adventures of this Salian prince

concerned only a small people and a corner of Gaul. After the Battle of Châlons and the dissolution of the temporary league formed against Attila, that country remained for thirty years in a state of anarchy. The empire in the west had fallen in 476 when Odoacer, a Herulian chief, deposed Romulus Augustulus and founded the first barbarian kingdom in Italy. In Gaul this event passed unnoticed, for a Roman general Aegidius, whom Gregory of Tours calls "King of the Romans," held the land between the Loire and the Somme, which no barbarian tribe had yet occupied; he left his power to his son, Syagrius. The cities of Armorica had long ruled themselves independently. The Franks were very numerous in Belgium. The Britons, attacked on their island by Saxon pirates, in their turn pillaged Angers near the Loire. One of the later emperors had ceded to the Visigoths all Gaul south of the Loire and west of the Rhône, and the barbarians had seized Arles, Marseilles, and Aix on the left bank of the river. The Bretons penetrated into Berry, the Franks as far as Narbonne, which they sacked. There was a perpetual coming and going. Tribes hurried pell-mell from north to south, from east to west; all sought fortune sword in hand. The peaceful Gallo-Romans of the towns revived their militia and profited from the universal disorder to settle old disputes. In the midst of the chaos there was heard only the mighty voice of the Church speaking of order to these raging hordes and stretching out her hand to guard the weak. The council of Arles (452) forbade the re-enslavement of freedom for the crime of ingratitude, unless guilt was judicially proved. The council of Orange (441) threatened with ecclesiastical censure those who tried to reduce to slavery men freed by the Church, and forbade the surrender of slaves who had taken sanctuary.

THIRD PERIOD—MEROVINGIAN FRANCE

(481–687)

CHAPTER VI

CLOVIS (481–511)

Gaul in 481.—At the moment when Clovis, son of Childeric, was raised on the shield by the Salians to be their war lord, and the authentic history of the Franks really begins, eight distinct dominions existed in Gaul. Between the Loire and the Pyrenees lay the kingdom of the Visigoths, who also held three parts of Spain, and beyond the Rhône were masters of all the country between the Durance and the sea. The valley of the Saône and of the Rhône as far as the Durance was the dominion of the Burgundians. Between the mouth of the Loire and that of the Seine the Armorican cities retained their independence under native chiefs or municipal magistrates. Between the Mayenne, the middle Loire, and the Somme, Syagrius ruled such districts as still remained to the empire. Between the Vosges and the Rhine, the Alemanni had taken the place of the Burgundians, who had definitely settled further south. A colony of Saxons was established near Bayeux, in sufficient numbers to induce Aëtius to seek their aid against Attila, while some colonists who had come from Great Britain a century before had established themselves in the west of Armorica, where they formed an independent state, the lesser Britain, the name of which was gradually extended over the whole peninsula. Finally all Belgium was in the power of the Franks whose chief rulers resided at Cologne, Tournai, Cambrai, and Terouenne.

It seemed impossible that Gaul could be delivered from this chaos. The kingdom of Syagrius was neither Roman enough nor barbarian enough to endure: it was an incoherent relic. The Armoricans aimed merely at living undisturbed, while the Saxons held only a small part of Gaul and have left not a trace of their settlement. There were, however, three races possessed of a wide extent of territory and able to dispute the control of the whole country.

The Burgundians.—The Burgundians were no longer a savage race; they had come under the softening influences of Latin civilisation and of Christianity. If they could still be described as "barbarians," they had long been in intimate contact with the Roman world. Before the invasion, many of them had settled as traders and merchants in the cities of Gaul, and when imperial authority was destroyed they only seized without violence a third of the land and a third of the slaves in the districts which they occupied. For the Gallo-Romans they had no contempt, nor did they treat them with wounding insolence. The Burgundian code was greatly influenced by Roman law, and was marked by refinements which indicated a gentleness not habitual in the adventurous wanderers of the fifth century. "Whoever," according to the provision of one of these laws, "refuses shelter and warmth to a stranger shall be punished by a fine of three gold pence. If a stranger comes to the house of a Burgundian and demands hospitality, and if the latter then sends him on to the house of a Roman, and this can be proved, the Burgundian shall pay three pence as a fine and three pence as damages to the man whose house he has pointed out." Unfortunately for their tenure of power the Burgundians had been converted to Arianism.

The Visigoths.—The Visigoths were no more terrible. They had been cantoned in the empire for a century, not like the Franks on its frontier, and in a district which constant ravages had restored to barbarism, but in the heart of the richest provinces. Many of the fathers of the tribe had seen Constantinople and all the imposing memorials of Latin civilisation. The court of the Visigothic kings at Toulouse was already distinguished by its elegance and luxury despite the presence in it of numerous barbarians who came there to seek the aid of the mighty sovereign who ruled three parts of Spain and a third of Gaul. "I have waited for two whole moons," says Sidonius Apollinaris, a noble Arvenian, the first poet of the age and afterwards a bishop, "without securing a single audience; the master of these lands has little leisure to spend on me, for the whole world seeks an answer to its petitions, and awaits his pleasure with respect. Here you may see the blue-eyed Saxon, bold at sea, ill at ease on land. Here is the Sicambrian veteran, shorn after a defeat, allowing his hair to grow once more. Here is the Herulian, his cheeks as green as the ocean, on the furthest shores of which he has made his home. Here is the Burgundian, seven feet tall, bending his knee and praying for peace. Here the

Ostrogoth demands the royal patronage to which he owes his power, and by the help of which he caused the Huns to tremble ; proud towards all others, he is meek at the court of Toulouse. Here may you yourself be seen, O Roman, for hither you come to beg for life, and when fresh calamities threaten from the north, you solicit the help of Euric against the hordes of Scythia ; you pray the mighty Garonne to protect the feeble Tiber."

If any one had then tried to discover to what people the inheritance of Gaul would fall, he would not have hesitated to promise eternal dominion to the Visigoths. But that people, despite the courage which they had shown on the field of Châlons, had lost their pristine energy. Moreover, like the Burgundians, they were Arians, with the result that their creed brought them into conflict with their Gallo-Roman subjects. Already the hatred which subsisted between the orthodox and the heretic rulers served to produce on the one hand persecution and on the other secret conspiracies, or at least a desire for and hope of deliverance.

The Franks: Manners and Religion.—" The Franks," says Thierry, " wore reddish hair rolled back on the top of their heads in a kind of tufted knot and falling down their backs like a horse's tail. They were clean shaven, except for long moustaches which hung down on either side of the mouth. They wore linen cloaks, held round the body and thighs by a large belt from which their swords hung. Their favourite weapon was an axe with one or two edges, the iron of which was heavy and sharp, the handle being very short. They began a battle by throwing these axes from a distance either at the face or at the shield of the enemy, and rarely failed to strike the exact mark at which they aimed. Besides the axe, which they called *francisque*, they bore also a species of javelin, peculiar to them and called in their language, *hang*, hook. It was a pike of moderate length, capable of being used either at close quarters or from a distance. The point, which was long and strong, was supplied with numerous hooks or barbs, sharp and bent like fish-hooks. The wood of this weapon was protected with plates of iron for almost its whole length, in such a way that it could not be broken or cut by the stroke of a sword. When this *hang* transfixed a shield, the hooks rendered its extraction impossible ; it remained suspended while its other end dragged on the ground. The Frank who had thrown it then leaped forward, and placing his foot on the javelin, leaned on it with all his weight, forcing his opponent to lower his arm and expose his head and breast.

Sometimes the *hang*, with a rope attached to it, served as a sort of harpoon to drag in whatever it caught. While one Frank hurled this weapon, a second held the rope; the two then united their efforts, either to disarm the enemy or to drag him in by his clothes or armour."

The religion of the Franks was the rude and warlike cult of Odin, the god of Scandinavia. They believed that after death the warrior was received into Valhalla, a palace built in the clouds, the joys of which were eternal battles interrupted only by long feasts, in which beer and hydromel flowed for ever. Each hero drank from the skull of some foe whom he had slain. "The Franks were thus filled with a passionate love of war, as the means by which they might become wealthy in this world and the boon companions of the gods in the world to come. The youngest and most violent sometimes exhibited in battle an access of fanatic frenzy, under the influence of which they appeared to be insensible of pain and to be endued with an extraordinary vitality. They remained standing and fought on, though covered with wounds, the slightest of which would have sufficed to kill any other men." The same warlike fanaticism was afterwards found in the Northmen. An Anglo-Saxon song gives some idea of their blood-drunkenness, this lust of slaughter, which inspired the Franks in battle. "The army moves out to battle; the birds sing, the grasshoppers chirp, the clash of arms is heard. Now the moon wandering through the clouds begins to shine; now comes the hour when tears will flow indeed. Soon the disorder of bloodshed will rage; the warriors drag bloody shields from the arms of their foes; skulls are shattered by the sword. The citadel re-echoes with the noise of blows; crows black and sombre circle round as the willow leaves fall in autumn; the flash of weapons lights up the castle as though it blazed. Never have I heard of battle fairer to behold."

Political Institutions of the Franks: Election of their Kings.—The political institutions of the Franks were those of all the Germanic tribes. Each tribe had a chief whom the Romans called a king, but who possessed neither the power nor the majesty implied by that title. These rulers, like the majority of German rulers, were chosen exclusively from a single family, endowed with a species of religious consecration. Among the Franks this family, from which the kings of all the tribes of the confederation were chosen, was that of the legendary Meroveus. But while the warriors respected this ancient right, they did not regard themselves as bound to absolute allegiance or to implicit

obedience; they were very ready to abandon one Merovingian for another who promised them greater booty.

Popular Assemblies.—"Among the Germans," says Tacitus, "the princes decide upon matters of little moment, while all have a voice in the decision of weightier matters, though the very points which are reserved for the decision of the people are previously discussed by the chiefs. Except in the case of some sudden emergency, they meet on stated days, either at the full or at the change of the moon, which they regard as the most auspicious moment for undertaking any enterprise. In computing time, they do not reckon, as we do, by days but by nights. All their resolutions and summonses to meetings run in this form, so that with them the night seems to lead the day. A certain inconvenience results from this very independence; they do not all assemble punctually at the same time, as if in obedience to a command, but occupy two or three days in gathering an assembly. When the numbers present seem to be sufficient, they sit down armed. Silence is proclaimed by the priests, who have also power to check disorder. Then the king or some other chief distinguished for his age, noble birth, achievements, or eloquence speaks, securing a hearing rather by the power of persuasion than by any weight of authority. If a speech arouses displeasure, they give vent to murmurs; if it is approved, they clash their arms, and this applause of weapons is among them the most honourable expression of assent."

Weakness of the Salian Tribe: Victory of Soissons (486).—In 481, Clovis, the real founder of the Frank empire, only held a part of Belgium, with the title of King of the Salian Franks, who were settled round Tournai. The army at his disposal amounted only to some four or five thousand warriors, and the first five years of his reign passed in an obscurity for which his youth supplies an explanation. At the age of twenty, he suggested a campaign to his men, induced Ragnachaire, King of Cambrai, to join him, and near the old abbey of Nogent, twelve kilometres north of Soissons, the two, at the head of 5000 warriors, defeated Syagrius who fled to the Visigoths. He was afterwards handed over to Clovis and put to death.

Story of the Vase of Soissons.—Considerable spoil was taken after this victory. St. Remigius, Bishop of Reims, who seems early to have entered into friendly relations with Clovis, sought from the king the return of a precious vase which had been taken from one of his churches. When the spoil was set forth, the king,

before it was divided, said, "I ask, my men, that you will give me this vase over and above my share in the spoil." All agreed except one soldier who, striking the vase with his axe, cried, "You shall have nothing except what falls to you by lot." But the others agreed to the king's wish, and Clovis, taking the half broken vase, returned it to the bishop. Next year at the assembly which was held annually in March, Clovis reviewed his army: when he came to the soldier who had struck the vase, he said, "No one has his arms so ill kept as yours." He seized the man's weapons and threw them on the ground. As the soldier bent to pick them up, the king cleft his head with his battle axe, crying, "Thus did you strike the vase a year ago at Soissons." Gregory of Tours adds, "In this way he filled all with a great fear."

This story indicates the rights of a barbarian king, which were at once unlimited and restricted. Clovis, like any one of his soldiers, could obtain only that share of the spoil which fell to him by lot. At the same time he killed a man without trial to avenge a personal injury, and not a murmur was heard. Clearly two contrary ideas were in conflict in the minds of the barbarians; the sacred character of monarchy conflicted with an invincible love of equality, a conflict of ideas which is not peculiar to this period of French history.

Marriage of Clovis and Clotilda (493).—The years which followed the Battle of Soissons were spent in negotiations and wars with the towns between the Somme and the Loire. Clovis was especially anxious to secure control of Paris, and for a long time harassed that city. But St. Geneviève, a holy maiden, whose memory has remained popular in a city where popularity is short lived, was within the walls and maintained the courage of the inhabitants. Another course was given to events by a war with the Thuringians, which called Clovis beyond the Rhine, and by his marriage with Clotilda, niece of Gondebad, King of the Burgundians. Clotilda was a Catholic, and she secured that her firstborn should be consecrated to Christ by baptism. This was an event of the utmost importance. The bishops of northern Gaul, who had doubtless arranged the marriage, hoped for the speedy conversion of the king himself, and the cities of Amiens, Beauvais, Paris, and Rouen opened their gates to the man who had married a woman of their faith.

Battle of Tolbiac: Conversion of Clovis (496).—The Alemanni had long attacked Gaul as the Franks had done, but they occupied only some districts along the Vosges, lands which had been

so often wasted that there was nothing left to be taken from them. Seeing that the Franks had laid hands upon wealthy Roman cities, they wished to secure a share in this spoil, and passed the Rhine in great numbers. The Franks advanced to meet them with Clovis at their head. The conflict was terrible ; Clovis for a moment believed that he was defeated, and in his distress called upon the God of Clotilda. A more violent charge turned the tide of battle ; the Alemanni, driven back over the Rhine, were pursued as far as Suabia, and the people of that land, as well as the Bavarians who inhabited the neighbouring district, recognised the supremacy of the Franks.

The very magnitude of his success convinced Clovis that he must keep his vow. St. Remigius baptised him, and three thousand of his nobles also accepted the Christian faith. As he poured the water on the head of the new convert, the bishop cried, " Bow thy head in meekness, O Sicambrian, adore what thou hast burned, burn what thou hast adored." Then reviving a custom which had existed in the days of the Jewish kings, he anointed him with the sacred chrism.

This baptism and consecration effected little apparent change in the character of Clovis ; in place of calling upon Odin he called upon Christ, but his nature was unaltered. By a curious chance, however, he was the only orthodox prince of that time in Gaul and in the whole of western Christendom. The Gallo-Roman population, oppressed by the Burgundians and the Visigoths, at once fixed their attention and hopes upon the converted chief of the Franks. The whole episcopate of Gaul supported him. Avitus, Bishop of Vienne, wrote to him, " Your faith is our victory ; when you fight, we triumph," and Pope Anastasius declared that the apostolic see rejoiced that God had provided for the safety of the Church by raising up so mighty a prince to protect her.

The Burgundians made Tributary: Defeat of the Visigoths.— The conversion of Clovis alienated some of his followers ; his success, and especially the booty which was to be won under so able a leader, conciliated them. The land between the Loire and the Seine was subdued ; Armorica was won over to the Frankish alliance. Having thus, with a degree of prudence unusual in these barbaric chiefs, established his position in the north, Clovis wished to extend his conquests southwards. He first attacked the Burgundians. Clotilda urged him to this war, that she might avenge the death of her father who had been murdered by Gondebad. King Gondiac, who had died in 463,

had left four sons among whom his dominions had been divided. The eldest, Gondebad, in order to secure the whole inheritance, had killed with his own hand one of his brothers, Chilperic, the father of Clotilda, and had burned another to death. The fourth, Godegisil, still retained his share, but fearing a like fate, secretly appealed to Clovis. Gondebad was defeated near Dijon and fled to Avignon, where Clovis followed him and forced him to pay tribute. The King of the Franks had hardly withdrawn when Gondebad surprised his brother at Vienne and stabbed him in a church to which he had fled for refuge.

After his defeat Syagrius had taken refuge with the Visigoths, who, already fearing a war with the Franks, had given up the fugitive. Later Clovis and Alaric II. had an interview near Amboise. "They spoke with each other," says Gregory of Tours, "ate and drank together, and after promising friendship towards one another, they departed in peace. But all the peoples of Gaul then eagerly desired to be under the rule of the Franks. Thus when a dispute arose at Rodez between the bishop, Quentin, and the citizens, the Goths who inhabited the town were filled with violent suspicion, since the citizens accused Quentin of wishing to bring the place under the rule of the Franks. Having taken counsel, they resolved to kill him. Informed of this design the man of God arose during the night and with his most faithful clergy left the town of Rodez and retired to Auvergne."

It is not known whether the bishops of the south who were thus persecuted called on Clovis to protect them. But one day the king told his soldiers how greatly it annoyed him that the Arians should hold part of Gaul. "Let us march with God's help," he said, "and after conquering them, bring their land under our sway." This suggestion pleased all the warriors, and the army moved on Poitiers, carefully sparing, by the express orders of Clovis, the property of the churches on its line of march. In the legends of the expedition, miracles marked the advance of the Franks. On the banks of the Vienne, a hind of wonderful beauty suddenly appeared from a wood and revealed a ford for which the king was searching. To light the march during the night, a ball of fire blazed from the tower of the church of St. Hilary of Poitiers.

Not far from that city, in the plain of Voulon, the two armies met. The King of the Visigoths with his best soldiers fell on the field of battle. Poitiers, Saintes, and Bordeaux opened their gates to the conqueror; next year he entered Toulouse. The

Visigoths would have lost all their possessions north of the Pyrenees had not the great Theodoric, King of the Ostrogoths in Italy, come to their aid. An army which he sent to Gaul defeated the Franks and Burgundians, who had united for the conquest of Provence, near Arles, while, on the other side of the Rhône, Carcassonne made an energetic defence. Septimania, the coast from the Rhône to the Pyrenees, remained to the Visigoths, and the district south of the Durance was annexed by the Ostrogoths.

Clovis, Master of the Greater Part of Gaul.—With the exception of this narrow strip of coast on the Mediterranean, Clovis held the whole country from the Rhine to the Pyrenees, either under his direct rule or through his allies, the Burgundians and Armoricans. A great barbarian kingdom was thus founded in Gaul, a land so naturally fitted to be under a single rule. When Clovis re-entered Tours, he found envoys from Anastasius, the Emperor of the East, who, delighted at seeing the rise of a rival to the great Ostrogoth beyond the Alps, sent to the Frankish king "the ornaments of the consulship." Clovis then assumed the crown and, mounted on his horse, threw gold and silver to the assembled people. From this time he was styled Consul and Augustus. These titles, which were vaguely supposed to have been conferred by the emperor, appeared to legitimatise a position which rested only on force. Clovis, in the eyes of the Gallo-Romans, was no longer a conquering barbarian and a pagan, but an orthodox prince and a Roman Consul.

It was unfortunate for the cause of orthodoxy and for the reputation of the consulate that the change in the character of Clovis was purely nominal; under the *chlamys*, under the catechumen's robe, he still remained a barbarian.

Clovis causes the Death of the Other Frankish Kings.—Clovis established his residence at Paris. "While he was residing in that city," says Gregory of Tours, "he sent secretly to the son of Sigebert, saying, 'Your father is an old man; he is lame, and if he were to die, you would secure his kingdom.' Seduced by the desire thus aroused, Chloderic designed to murder his father. One day Sigebert went out from Cologne, crossed the Rhine, and as he passed through the Buconian Wood, and slept at midday in his tent, he was murdered by assassins sent by his son. Then Chloderic sent word to Clovis, 'My father is dead, and I have his kingdom and treasures in my power; send some of your men to me and I will willingly give you such of my treasures as you may desire.' Clovis answered, 'I thank Heaven

for your friendship and I desire that you will show your treasures to these messengers, and afterwards you shall keep them all.' Chloderic showed his father's treasures to the envoys, and while they examined them, the prince said, 'In this chest my father was used to horde his gold coins.' They answered, 'Put your hand down to the bottom of the chest that we may see how much there is in it.' He did so, and as he bent over the chest one of the envoys raised his axe and shattered his skull. Thus this unworthy son suffered the death which he had inflicted on his father. When Clovis knew that Sigebert and his son were both dead, he went to Cologne, assembled the people, and said to them, 'Hear what has occurred while I was sailing on the Scheldt. Chloderic, my relative's son, troubled his father by telling him that I desired to kill him, and as Sigebert fled into the Buconian Wood, sent murderers who put him to death. He himself, as he opened the treasure chests of his father, has also perished in some manner, how, I do not know. I am not an accomplice in either of these crimes; I could not shed the blood of my relatives, for to do so is forbidden. But since these events have occurred, I give you my advice; take it, if it is acceptable to you. Come over to me and place yourselves under my protection.' The people applauded these words with their hands and lips, and having raised him on the shield made him their king. 'For so God daily increased his kingdom and subdued his enemies under his feet, because Clovis walked with a right heart before Him, and did that which was pleasing in his sight.'

"In his war against Syagrius Clovis had invoked the help of Chararic, King of Therouenne, but he had stood aside, awaiting the issue of the battle that he might ally himself with the victor. Clovis did not forget this and, as soon as he could, entrapped him, took him prisoner with his son, and forced them both to receive the tonsure, ordering that they should be ordained priests. When Chararic was overcome by his shame and wept, his son is said to have answered him, 'Branches which are cut from a tree green and living do not wither but quickly throw out new shoots. Please God he who has done this shall die soon.' The saying was told to Clovis; he believed that they threatened to allow their hair to grow again and then to kill him; he therefore ordered that both should be executed. After their death, he seized their kingdom, their treasures, and their subjects."

"There was still at Cambrai a king named Ragnachaire, who became so violent in his cups that he scarcely spared his nearest

relatives. Clovis had bracelets and belts of gold made and gave them to Ragnachaire's nobles in order to rouse them against him. He then advanced with his army against this chief and defeated him. Ragnachaire's own soldiers handed him with his brother Richaire over to Clovis, their hands bound behind their backs. When Ragnachaire came into the presence of the king, Clovis cried, 'Why have you brought shame on our family by allowing yourselves to be bound? It would have been better for you to have died.' Then raising his hatchet, he cleft his skull. Turning towards Richaire, he said, 'If you had aided your brother, he would not have been bound,' and he killed him in the same way with his axe. After their death those who had betrayed them found that the gold which the king had given them was false. They told Clovis, who replied, 'Such gold is the just reward for one who willingly betrays his master to death,' and added that they should be content that their lives had been spared. These kings were relatives of Clovis. Renomer was also killed by his orders in the town of Le Mans. After their death, Clovis secured their dominions and their treasures."

Clovis, Sole Chief of the Frankish Tribes: His Death at Paris.—"Having killed many other kings, as well as his near relatives, owing to his fear that they might take his dominions from him, he extended his power over the whole of Gaul. It is said that one day he assembled all his subjects and spoke of the relatives whom he had thus brought to their death. 'Woe is me, for I am as a wanderer among strangers, having no relatives should adversity fall upon me.' But it was not that he was grieved at their death; he spoke with guile, that he might discover whether any of his relatives still survived, and if so, might put them to death. When all these events had occurred, Clovis died at Paris where he was buried in the basilica of the Holy Apostles (St. Geneviève), which he had built with Queen Clotilda. He died five years after the Battle of Voulon, at the age of forty-five, having reigned for thirty years."

The first council of the Gallican Church was held in the year of Clovis's death. Among its canons the principle of the regalia may be found, the right of the prince to receive the revenues of a benefice during a vacancy.

CHAPTER VII

THE SONS OF CLOVIS (511–561)

Partition of the Frankish Monarchy between the Four Sons of Clovis.—At the death of Clovis, the state which he had founded included all Gaul except Gascony, into which no Frankish army had yet penetrated, and Brittany, which was ruled by counts, or military chiefs, established at Nantes, Vannes, and Rennes. The Alemanni, in Alsace and Suabia, were rather bound to the fortunes of the Franks than directly ruled by their king. The Burgundians, even before the death of Clovis, had refused the tribute which they had paid for a time, and the cities of Aquitaine, lightly held by Frankish garrisons left at Bordeaux and Saintes, remained practically independent.

The victorious Franks were united only for the purpose of making conquests and taking booty. They were content with expelling the Visigoths from Aquitaine and did not attempt to replace them; as soon as the war was ended, they had returned home to the north with their spoil. Clovis had established himself at Paris, in a central position between the Rhine and the Loire, from which he could easily watch over Brittany, Aquitaine, the Burgundians, and the Frankish tribes of Belgium.

The four sons of Clovis divided their inheritance, and the control of their *leudes*, or vassals, in such a way that each had an almost equal share of the land north of the Loire, in which the Frankish nation was established, and some of the Roman cities of Aquitaine from which a rich tribute was derived. Childebert, King of Paris, held also Poitiers, Périgeux, Saintes, and Bordeaux; Clotaire, King of Soissons, held Limoges; Clodomir, King of Orleans, held Bourges; Thierry, King of Metz, held Cahors and Auvergne.

This curious division contained the seeds of the quarrels which soon broke out, and as owing to the partitions all the provinces became frontier provinces, no one of them escaped pillage and devastation. The old enmities of the Gallic cities were also revived by the partition, and the militia of the towns more than once engaged in bloody combats in the quarrels of their masters.

Conquest of Thuringia and Burgundy.—For some years the impulse towards conquest which Clovis had given continued. Thierry successfully repulsed the Danes who had appeared at

the mouth of the Meuse, and also conquered Thuringia. That land had three kings, Baderic, Hermanfrid, and Berthar. The second of these was married to a villainous wife who sowed the seeds of civil war among the brothers. Under her influence, her husband killed Berthar, but did not dare to attack Baderic. One day at mealtime he found only half his table laid, and when he asked the meaning of this, his wife answered, "It is fitting that a man who is content with half a kingdom should have only half a table." Hermanfrid, aroused by this speech and others similar to it, secretly sent messengers to Thierry in order to persuade him to attack his brother, telling him, "If you put him to death, we will divide his land." Baderic fell by the sword, but Hermanfrid failed to keep his promise to Thierry, and as a result violent hostility arose between them.

"One day," says Gregory of Tours, "having assembled the Franks, Thierry said to them, 'I ask you to remember that the Thuringians attacked your fathers, took from them all that they possessed, and hanged their children to the trees by the sinews of their thighs. They inflicted a cruel death on two hundred young maidens, each of whom they bound by their arms to the necks of two horses, which they then forced by blows of sharp arrows to gallop in opposite directions, so that the girls were torn in pieces. Others were stretched on the roads and fastened to the earth by stakes; heavy waggons were then driven over them, and their crushed remains left as food for dogs and birds.' At these words, the Franks with one voice demanded war against the Thuringians. Thierry took with him as allies his brother Clotaire and his son Theudebert, massacred many of the Thuringians, and brought their land under his rule."

"While the Frankish kings were in Thuringia, Thierry attempted to kill his brother. He caused a curtain to be hung from one wall of the house to the other, concealed armed men behind this, and sent word to his brother that he wished to discuss some important matter with him. But as the curtain was too short, the men's feet showed beneath it, and Clotaire saw them before he entered the room; he accordingly kept his arms and took care that he should be well guarded. Thierry realised that his plot was discovered, but invented some explanation; they discussed various matters, and as he did not know how to give a reason for summoning his brother, he presented him with a large silver dish. Clotaire thanked him for the gift and went away. When he returned to his tent, Thierry complained to his men that he had lost the dish to no profit,

and finally said to his son, ' Go and find your uncle and ask him to give you the present that I have made to him.' The boy went and obtained his request; Thierry was especially skilled in ruses of this kind."

"When he returned home, he persuaded Hermanfrid to visit him, promising him that he should run into no danger, and enriched him with honourable presents. But one day as they were talking together on the walls of Tolbiac, Hermanfrid, pushed by some unknown person, fell from the top of the wall and so gave up the ghost."

Conquest of the Burgundians.—Clovis had reduced the Burgundians to tribute, but Clotilda was still dissatisfied. The death of Gondebad failed to appease her hatred, and one day she said to Clodomir and her other sons, "That I may not have to repent of having nourished you with tenderness, my dearest children, I pray you, be aroused by my wrongs and avenge the death of my father and mother." The Frankish kings, therefore, marched against the two Burgundian kings, Gondemar and Sigismund, the latter of whom had recently caused his son to be strangled in his sleep. The Burgundians were defeated and Sigismund taken prisoner; Clodomir caused him to be thrown down a well with his wife and his other son. But one day, pursuing the enemy with too little caution, he was himself surrounded and slain at Veséronce near Vienne (524).

This defeat served to postpone the conquest of Burgundy, but in 532 Clotaire and Childebert prepared a new expedition and invited their brother Thierry to join with them. The King of Austrasia refused. "If you will not go against the Burgundians with your brothers," his nobles said to him, "we will abandon you and follow them." Thierry had another expedition in view; the people of Auvergne having attempted to withdraw themselves from his rule and to place themselves under that of Childebert, he wished to punish them. "Follow me to Auvergne," he told his men, "and I will lead you into a land where you will be able to take as much gold and silver as you desire, where you can seize herds, slaves, and garments in abundance." Clotaire and Childebert then attacked the Burgundians alone, besieged Autun, and having put Gondemar to flight, occupied the whole land. Meanwhile, Thierry kept faith with his men; he abandoned Auvergne to them and they devastated the land with frightfulness.

Adventures of Attalus.—After his account of these events, Gregory of Tours tells a story which exhibits the manners of the

age and the sad condition of the richest Gallo-Romans, brought against their will into contact with barbarian kings, for whose caprices they often paid with their liberty.

The war of Auvergne produced ill-feeling between Thierry and Childebert. "They were reconciled, and having taken oath not to attack one another, gave mutual hostages in confirmation of their promises. Among these hostages were many sons of senators. New disputes arose between the kings, and their hostages were reduced to slavery and condemned to labour on public works or to become the servants of their gaolers. Several escaped and returned to their native land. Among those who remained in slavery was Attalus, a nephew of St. Gregory, Bishop of Langres. Attalus served a barbarian living in the district of Treves; when Gregory sent servants to search for him, and when they had found him, they offered his master presents. He refused them, saying, 'Considering his birth, I must have ten gold pounds as ransom.' When the servants had returned, Leo, who was in the kitchen of the bishop, said to him, 'If you will allow me to go, I may perhaps deliver your nephew from captivity.' The bishop was delighted at these words, and Leo made his way to the place of which he had been told. His first design was to carry off the boy secretly, but in this attempt he failed. He then said to one of his companions, 'Sell me to this barbarian; you shall have the price which he pays.' The man willingly accepted the offer and sold him for twelve pieces of gold. His new master asked Leo what work he could do. 'I am skilled,' he answered, 'in cooking everything that is eaten at table, and I am not afraid that you will ever find my equal in this accomplishment; when you wish to give the king a banquet, I can prepare royal dishes.' 'Well,' said the barbarian, 'on the approaching festival of the Sun'—for so the barbarians call the Lord's Day—'my neighbours and relations are invited to my house; prepare them a feast which shall cause them to say, "We could not have found a better in the king's palace."' Leo answered, 'Let my master order that I may be supplied with a great quantity of birds and I will perform his command.'

"He was given what he desired. Sunday came and he caused the choicest delicacies to be served. The guests praised the feast highly; the master thanked his servant and gave him authority over all that he possessed, including the duty of supplying food to all who were there. As he took care to please his master in every way, the barbarian placed entire confidence

in him. At the end of a year, Leo went to the field near the house where Attalus guarded the horses, and crouching on the ground far from him, with his back towards him, that no one might see that they were speaking to each other, he said to the young man, 'It is time that we should attempt to return to our own land; I tell you, therefore, to-night, when you have gathered all the horses in the enclosure, do not go to sleep, but when I call you, come, and we will set out.' The barbarian that evening invited to a feast many of his relatives, among them his son-in-law. When they had left the table about midnight, and had withdrawn to their rooms, Leo carried some drink to his master's son-in-law, who as he drank it said, 'Tell me, as you are in the confidence of my father-in-law, when you will be seized with a wish to take horses and return to your own land?' He spoke jestingly and in good humour, and Leo, answering him in the same spirit, laughed and said truthfully, 'That is my plan for to-night, God willing.' The other replied, 'Well, then, I will tell my servant to keep watch that you steal nothing of mine.' They parted laughing. When every one was asleep, Leo called Attalus, and when the horses were saddled, asked if he had arms. Attalus answered that he had only a small lance. Leo entered his master's bedroom and took his shield and spear. The barbarian asked who was there: Leo replied, 'Leo your servant; I am going to make Attalus get up quickly and take the horses to pasture, for he is sleeping like a drunkard.' The barbarian said, 'Do what you will,' and once more went to sleep. Leo, going out again, supplied the young man with arms, and, by the grace of God, found open the gate which, in order to guard the horses, had been fastened at the beginning of the night with bolts driven home by blows from a mallet. They gave thanks to the Lord, and mounting, hastened away with all speed. When they reached the banks of the Moselle, they found men who tried to stop them, but having left their horses and clothes, they crossed the river on planks, and when night came entered a forest where they lay hid. For three days and nights they went forward without finding food; then, by the mercy of God, they found a tree covered with plums and, eating them, gained enough strength to enable them to continue their journey. They entered Champagne, and as they approached Reims heard the sound of horses, and said, 'Let us lie on the ground, that the men who come may not see us.' They threw themselves down behind a great bramble bush, holding their swords ready in their hands. The horsemen halted as they reached the bush, and one said,

'Alas ! I shall never find these wretches ! But by my faith if I do catch them, one shall be hanged, and I will cut the other in pieces with my sword.' It was their master who spoke ; he had come from the city of Reims where he had gone to search for them, and would have found them on his way if night had not hidden them. When he had gone away, they resumed their journey, and entering the town early on a Sunday, went to the house of the priest Paulellus, who was united to St. Gregory by long-standing friendship. Leo gave him his master's name. 'My dream has come true,' cried the priest, 'last night I saw two doves, one white and the other black, which flew and perched on my hand.' They said to the priest, 'God will forgive us though we eat before matins on his day. We beg you to give us some food, since this is the fourth time that the sun has risen since we last tasted any bread or cooked food.' The priest gave them bread soaked in wine ; then he hid the two youths and went to matins. Meanwhile the barbarian had found their track : he followed Paulellus to the church, but the priest deceived him and he went away. The young men lived for two days in this house, and then, having regained their strength, set out to rejoin Gregory. The bishop, rejoiced to see them, wept on the neck of his nephew Attalus ; he freed Leo and all his family from the yoke of servitude, giving him lands on which he lived as a free man for the rest of his days with his wife and children."

'**Wars against the Visigoths and Ostrogoths: Expeditions across the Alps (539) and the Pyrenees (542).**—Theodoric, King of the Ostrogoths, the mighty master of Italy, who had already checked the advance of Clovis, in 523 annexed Valais from the Burgundians, and Rouergue, Vivarais, and Velay from the Franks. But he died (526), and the Franks, taking the offensive, ravaged Septimania (531). This province, nevertheless, remained in the hands of the Visigoths who held it for two hundred years, and it was through this gate in the Pyrenees that the Arabs entered Frankish territory. In 533 the Austrasians recovered Rouergue, Velay, and Gévaudan ; three years later, Witigis, King of the Ostrogoths, ceded Provence to the Franks in order to gain their help against the Byzantines. Thudebert, who succeeded his father, Thierry, in 534, as King of Austrasia, led a large army into Italy, defeating in turn the Goths, who had bribed him to enter the peninsula, and the Byzantines. Disease decimated his host, but the number of dead did not trouble the Franks ; they considered only the booty to be gained, and they could plunder where they would (539). So rich was the spoil

won by Thudebert on this expedition that Childebert and Clotaire could only retain the loyalty of their vassals by promising them an equal booty from an attack on Spain. They crossed the Pyrenees and captured Pampeluna. But they were checked before Saragossa, and on their homeward march sustained a defeat (542).

Violent Deaths of almost all the Frankish Princes (524–558).—In those days princes did not grow old; they died young as a result of their excesses even when they escaped the murderous hands of relatives. Of the four sons of Clovis, Clodomir, King of Orleans, was first killed (524), falling, however, by the hand of an open enemy. He left three sons, who were protected by their grandmother, Clotilda. One day Childebert sent secretly to his brother Clotaire, saying, "Our mother keeps with her our brother's sons, and wishes to hand over the kingdom to them; come quickly to Paris that we may decide whether we will cut their hair, in order to reduce them to the level of the rest of our subjects, or whether we will kill them in order that we may divide our brother's inheritance." Greatly delighted by this message, Clotaire went to Paris. Childebert had already spread a report that the two kings had agreed to place the boys on their father's throne, and he next sent messengers to his mother, in the name of himself and his brother, saying, "Send the children to us, that we may raise them to the throne." She was filled with joy, and being ignorant of their craft, sent the children, after having feasted them, saying to them, "I shall cease to believe that I have lost a son when I see you succeed to his kingdom." As soon as the boys had set out, they were seized and parted from their servants. The kings then sent Arcadius to their mother with a pair of scissors and a sword. He came to the queen and showed them to her, saying, "Your sons, my masters, most glorious queen, wish to know in what way the children should be treated; decide whether their hair shall be cut and they be spared, or whether they shall be killed."

Dismayed by this message, and at the same time driven to extreme anger, the queen allowed her wrath to carry her away, and not knowing what she said in her grief, rashly answered, "If they are not to be placed on their throne, I would rather see them dead in their graves." Arcadius was little disturbed by her grief, and did not trouble to discover her true opinion; he returned quickly to those who had sent him, and told them that they could complete the work which they had begun, with the queen's approval. Clotaire at once seized the elder child by

the arm and threw him on the ground, stabbing him in the armpit. The other, at his brother's cries, fell at the feet of Childebert, saying with tears, "Help me, most pious father, that I may not die like my brother." Childebert was touched, and said to Clotaire, "My dearest brother, I beg you to grant me his life; if you consent not to kill him, I will pay what ransom you may demand." But Clotaire loaded him with abuse: "Drive the boy from you, or you shall certainly die in his place; you suggested to me that I should undertake this; you are quick to go back on your resolve." At these words, Childebert drove away the child, and threw him to Clotaire, who stabbed him in the side and killed him. Their servants and guardians were also slain, and when they were dead, Clotaire mounted his horse and rode off, without troubling in the least about the murder of his nephews. The queen had their bodies brought to her on a litter, and bore them with many pious chants and great sorrow to the church of St. Peter, where the two were buried together. The elder was ten years old, the younger was seven.

They failed to take the third child, Clodoald, who was saved by the help of some brave soldiers. Despising an earthly kingdom, he dedicated himself to God, cut his hair with his own hands, and became a clerk. He persisted in good works, and died a priest, being eventually canonised as St. Cloud.

At the death of Thierry (534), Clotaire and Childebert would gladly have treated his son Theudebert as they treated the sons of Clodomir. But he was already of age, and being also brave and popular with his men was able to protect himself. He was the most active and brilliant of the Merovingian princes. After his remarkable expedition into Italy, he meditated an attack on Constantinople, and it is impossible to guess what would have occurred if, turning the tide of invasion which had flowed from east to west for a century and a half, he had drawn from the midst of the west and hurled upon New Rome the disorderly and mighty host of the Germanic nations. But he was killed hunting. Some time before, his wife, Deuteria, jealous of the beauty of her own daughter, had placed her in a waggon drawn by wild bulls, by which means she was hurled from the top of a bridge and drowned in the river.

Theudebert died in 547; his son Theudebald died at the age of fourteen in 553, Clotaire seizing his inheritance. The new King of Austrasia had soon to deal with an attempted revolt of the Saxons, who refused to pay their tribute of five hundred cows. "As he advanced against them with his army, they came

to him with offers of submission, but his soldiers obliged him to drive them away without an answer. They returned, and offered half of all they possessed, and Clotaire, addressing his vassals, said, ' Abandon your project, I beg you, for right is not on your side ; if you are absolutely resolved on entering into battle, I will not follow you.' In anger, his vassals threw themselves upon him, destroyed his tent, loaded him with abuse, and forcibly seizing him wished to kill him. He then went with them to the battle, but the Franks were defeated." This story gives a clear indication of the manners of the Franks and their untamed spirit, and helps to explain the degradation which successively fell upon the two dynasties of the Merovingians and Carolingians.

Clotaire I., Sole King of the Franks (558–561).—Childebert, King of Paris, died in 558, and Clotaire, acquiring his inheritance also, was left as sole King of the Franks, reigning for three years over the whole monarchy of Clovis. His son, Chramm, had formed a plot against him with Childebert. On his uncle's death, he fled for refuge to Brittany ; his father pursued him, defeated the Bretons who tried to defend him, and, having taken him, left him bound with his wife and children in a peasant's hut which he set on fire.

He only survived his son for a year, dying in his manor of Compiègne, where he often stayed, in order to enjoy in the great forest which surrounded it those long hunting expeditions which so greatly delighted the first Merovingians. When death approached, this barbarian, struck by grief, felt that he was conquered at last : " What manner of king is this King of Heaven," he cried, " who causes even the greatest kings of the earth to perish ? "

St. Radegonde.—Among the wives of Clotaire there was one whose history gives us a little respite from all those stories of bloodshed. Radegonde was the daughter of that Berthar, King of Thuringia, who had fallen under the blows of his brother. She had herself formed part of a booty taken by Clotaire. That prince, struck by her extreme beauty, educated her with care and at a later date made her his wife. Radegonde viewed with horror the marriage which made her a queen. In her mind she dwelt ever in the midst of her murdered family ; she forgot them only when she stripped herself of the pomp of her position to live in the midst of the poor, to minister to their needs and tend their revolting wounds ; when she listened to some learned clerk or when she talked long with some bishop of the Holy Scriptures. " She is a nun, not a queen," said Clotaire brutally.

The cloister was in truth the asylum to which this tender and loving soul wished to escape from the gross passions by which she was surrounded. One day, when the king had caused her last surviving brother to be murdered, she hastened to Noyon and found the Bishop St. Medard at the altar. "I beg you, most holy father," she said, "to consecrate me to the Lord." There was reason to fear the heavy anger of the king; the bishop hesitated, since the church was full of Frankish soldiers, who threatened him. But the queen at once assumed the garb of a nun, and called upon him to give to God that which she wished to withdraw irrevocably from the world; and he consecrated her a deaconess by the laying on of hands.

Clotaire was enraged. Defeated at last by the patient opposition of the bishops, he allowed his wife, the daughter of the Thuringian kings, to found a monastery for women at Poitiers, of which she became the abbess. She entered it in 550, never to leave it again until her death thirty-seven years later. During this long seclusion, she devoted herself always to good works, and mingled the study of letters with strict religious observances. She ever cherished loving memories of her home, and the chief poet of the period, Fortunatus, who was ordained a priest in order that he might not leave her, has handed down her thoughts to us in his bad verse.

Human nature never loses its rights; in the midst of the most unbridled passions, pure and delicate feelings will yet be found. In the sixth century, it was the Church that offered a refuge to those gentle and lofty spirits whom the growing barbarism appalled. The cloister existed for those who sought peace and solitude; the ranks of secular clergy afforded scope for such as would exercise more active virtues, and for those who did not fear to speak to these bloodthirsty men of peace, of justice, and of love. Thus the worst periods of the Middle Ages preserved a morality superior to that of the best days of paganism, and humanity made progress even when it seemed to be cast down into a veritable abyss.

CHAPTER VIII

THE SONS AND GRANDSONS OF CLOTAIRE I. (561-618)

New Division in 561.—After the death of Clotaire I. (561), the monarchy was again divided into four kingdoms, those of Paris, Soissons, Metz, and Burgundy. The premature death of Caribert, King of Paris, reduced their number to three in 567. The division which followed was more enduring than those which had preceded it, since it corresponded with natural lines of partition and with distinct nationalities. Gontran ruled the Burgundians, Sigebert the Austrasians or eastern Franks, and Chilperic that mixed Frankish and Gallo-Roman people which was known as the Neustrians or western Franks. Aquitaine remained divided between the three kings, each of whom wished to have a share in the fair districts of the south and in those wealthy cities, the tribute of which filled their treasuries. Paris had already attained such importance that it could not be left to one of the brothers; it was decided that it should belong to all three, but that no one of them should enter the town without the permission of the other two.

Of these three kings, Gontran was the least distinguished but the longest lived; he witnessed the bloody catastrophies of which the other kingdoms were the scene.

Fredegar, a chronicler of the seventh century, has preserved the following popular story of this period. "One night as Childeric, father of Clovis, lay beside his wife, Basina, she said to him, 'Arise, O King, and tell your servant what you see passing through the courtyard of your palace.' Childeric rose, and saw beasts which resembled lions, unicorns, and leopards. He came back to his wife and told her what he had seen, and Basina answered, 'Master, go again, and tell your servant what you see.' Childeric rose a second time, and saw beasts like bears or wolves. Having told his wife this, she sent him a third time, when he saw dogs and other smaller beasts, which fell upon and tore each other. Then Basina said to Childeric, 'That which you have seen will truly come to pass. A son will be born to us who will be like a lion in courage; his sons will be like unicorns and leopards, but will in their turn have sons like bears and wolves in their greed. Those whom you saw last will come at the end, and accomplish the ruin of the kingdom.'"

On this occasion, popular fancy was justified; the history of the lion, of the unicorns and the leopards has been recorded, and the narrative now passes on to the ravening bears and wolves. Under the sons of Clovis, the spirit of conquest still filled the Franks; after their death, for a century and a half, the spirit of discord ruled supreme.

Rivalry of Neustria and Austrasia: Fredegonde and Brunhilde.—Nearer the Rhine, across which the barbarians had advanced westwards, Austrasia (Belgium and Lorraine) was filled with a very large Frankish population. Germanic customs prevailed, and a crowd of petty chieftains formed a powerful and warlike aristocracy, which was jealous of the kings. Neustria (Ile de France, Normandy, etc.) was more Roman because it contained a smaller barbarian element and more ancient cities; it accepted the authority of its kings, and preserved some memories and some traces of imperial administration. This divergence in manners and situation produced political hostility between Neustria and Austrasia, which burst forth in the rivalry of Fredegonde, wife of Chilperic, and Brunhilde, wife of Sigebert, and at a later date in that of Ebroin with the Austrasian mayors of the palace.

Invasion of the Avars and Lombards (562–576).—A new people, coming from Asia by the route which the Huns had followed, had penetrated into the valley of the Danube, which they ascended to hurl themselves against the Frankish empire. Sigebert, whose duty it was as King of Austrasia to defend the eastern frontiers, at first defeated the Avars (562), but six years later they advanced into Bavaria and Franconia, defeated Sigebert, and made him prisoner. Their victory appears, however, not to have been very decisive, since they released their captive and retired into Pannonia. At the same time, the Lombards, who had a few years earlier made themselves masters of Italy, penetrated to the banks of the Rhône (570–576). But the Franks retained too much of their primitive vigour for their new dominion to be so soon destroyed. The Lombards were driven back over the Alps, as the Avars had been expelled from the Germanic lands.

Murder of Galswintha (568).—While the King of Austrasia fought for the common cause, his brothers profited by his absence to pillage his western provinces. To this wrong, Chilperic added another, causing his wife Galswintha, sister of Brunhilde, to be strangled. These two women were daughters of Athanagild, King of the Visigoths, who by this double marriage

alliance had hoped to purchase the friendship of the Franks. Brunhilde, a woman of virile mind, had agreed without reluctance to her marriage with a king whom the Visigoths, softened by the mild climate of Spain, regarded as a barbarian. But Galswintha, less desirous of power, saw with terror the coming of the day when she would be obliged to leave her mother and to seek an unknown husband in the north. The ablest historian of this period has told, following the contemporary poet Fortunatus, the touching story of this wedding, and has painted the portrait of this gentle maiden, so unlike the barbarous age in which she lived. " When the Frankish ambassadors presented themselves to greet their king's betrothed, they found her weeping on her mother's breast, and rough as they were, were so moved that they did not dare to speak of departing. They allowed two days to pass, and on the third appeared before the queen, telling her this time that they must hasten their departure, and insisting on the impatience of Chilperic and the length of the journey. The queen with tears begged one more day's delay for her daughter. ' One day more, and I will ask nothing else ; you know that where you are taking my daughter she will have no mother.' " But all possible excuses for delay were exhausted ; Athanagild interposed his royal and paternal authority, and despite the grief of her mother, Galswintha was handed over to those who were to conduct her to her future husband. " A long file of horsemen, carriages, waggons, and baggage carts passed through the streets of Toledo, and moved towards the north gate. The king accompanied his daughter as far as a bridge over the Tagus, some distance from the city, but the queen could not bring herself to return so quickly, and went still further. Leaving her own carriage, she sat beside Galswintha, and stage after stage, day after day passed, until a hundred miles had been traversed. Each day she said, ' This day must see the end of my journey,' and then having reached the end of that stage still did not turn back. When they drew near the mountains, the roads became difficult, but the queen disregarded this, and would have gone even further. As, however, her escort greatly increased the numbers of the party, and this augmented both the difficulty and the danger of the journey, the Gothic nobles determined to allow her to go only one mile more. She was forced to submit to the inevitable parting, and new though calmer scenes of tenderness occurred between her and her daughter. The queen expressed in gentle words her sadness and her motherly fears. ' Be happy,' she said, ' but I

tremble for you ; take care of yourself, my daughter, take great care.' At these words, which corresponded only too nearly with her own presentiments, Galswintha wept. ' It is the will of God, and I must submit,' she said. Thus the sad parting took place."

" The numerous escort was split up ; horsemen and carriages were divided into two parts, some continuing on their way, the rest turning back to Toledo. Before entering the carriage which was to bear her home, the Gothic queen stood upright and immovable by the side of the road, and fixing her gaze upon her daughter's carriage, did not cease to watch her until it had disappeared in the distance behind a curve in the road. Galswintha, sad but resigned, continued her northward journey. Her escort was composed of nobles and warriors of the two nations, Goths and Franks ; it crossed the Pyrenees, passed through Narbonne and Carcassone, without having left the Visigothic realm which extended so far. Then it went by way of Poitiers and Tours to Rouen, which had been fixed upon as the place of the marriage. At the gates of each important town a halt was made and a solemn entry prepared. The horsemen threw off the cloaks which they wore on the journey, uncovered the harness of their horses, and assumed the shields which hung at their saddle-bows. The destined bride of the King of Neustria left her heavy travelling coach for a state carriage, constructed in the form of a tower and entirely covered with plates of silver.

" The nuptials of Galswintha were celebrated with as much magnificence and display as those of her sister Brunhilde. Honours unusual for a bride of this period were granted to her, and all the Neustrian Franks, nobles, and commoners swore fealty to her as to a king. Standing in a semicircle, they drew their weapons simultaneously, and brandishing them in the air repeated an old pagan formula which gave to the edge of the sword any one who violated this oath. Afterwards the king solemnly renewed his promise of constancy and conjugal faith ; placing his hand upon a casket containing relics, he swore that he would never repudiate the daughter of the Gothic king, and that while she lived he would never take to him any other woman."

For some months he kept his word ! Before her coming, Galswintha had a rival, Fredegonde, whose very name recalls all the bitterness and implacable cruelty there has ever been in a woman's heart. For a time, the arrival of the Gothic princess drove her back into that obscurity from which she had emerged, but she soon regained her former ascendancy over

Chilperic. Galswintha dared first to complain, and then to demand that she might return to her own land; Chilperic feared the loss of the treasure which formed her dower, and one night a faithless servant, entering her chamber, strangled her while she slept.

Murder of Sigebert (575).—Brunhilde wished to avenge her sister at once, and urged her husband to war. But Gontran interposed; the matter was referred to the decision of the popular assembly and sentence was given that Chilperic should hand over to Brunhilde five cities of Aquitaine which he had on the morrow of his wedding assigned as the dower lands of Galswintha. In 573 he tried to revoke this cession, and invaded the territories of Sigebert in Aquitaine. The King of Austrasia hurried to their defence, followed by a vast army drawn from beyond the Rhine which made his expedition seem like a new invasion. Chilperic in alarm made further concessions, but no sooner had Sigebert dismissed his savage levies than new provocations recalled him to Neustria. This time the Austrasian resolved to make an end of his brother. Nothing checked him; he entered Paris, and the Neustrians promised to accept his rule. Chilperic only preserved Tournai; Sigebert wished to take this from him. At the moment of his departure on this expedition he was met by a holy man, Germain, Bishop of Paris, who tried to drive from his heart the evil design which had been formed in it. "King Sigebert," said the bishop, "if you go forth with no design of killing your brother, you will return alive and victorious, but if you have any other thought, you will die, for the Lord has said, 'The pit which you dig for your brother you shall fall into the midst of it yourself.'" Sigebert did not answer; he received at Vitry the plaudits of the Neustrians who proclaimed him king, and then advanced against Tournai. But Fredegonde watched over her husband and herself; two soldiers, seduced by her charms, appeared at Vitry, where they demanded to see Sigebert and to speak with him privately. As he listened to them, one standing on either hand, they both stabbed him in the side with long poisoned daggers. He never uttered a cry as he fell dead, and Chilperic was saved (575).

Murder of Chilperic and Two of his Sons (584).—Brunhilde being then at Paris with her treasures and her infant son, afterwards Childebert II., was at the mercy of Chilperic. The King of Neustria seized the treasures and troubled little about the child. One of Sigebert's men made his way into the palace where the prince was imprisoned, hid him in a great basket, and allowing himself

to slide down a rope from the height of the walls, took the child to Metz by devious paths. Childebert was five years old ; the nobles none the less proclaimed him king, giving him a mayor of the palace to rule in his name. This minority favoured their wish for local independence.

Meanwhile Fredegonde struck terror into Neustria by her murders. Her husband had two sons by his first marriage, Merovius and Clovis, whose rights were superior to those of her own son, Clotaire. Merovius was rash enough to marry Brunhilde ; his step-mother seized the occasion to produce a quarrel between him and his father, and persecuted him with such bitterness that the wretched youth either committed suicide or was murdered by one of the queen's minions. His friends perished in horrible tortures. The Bishop of Rouen, who had performed the marriage, was himself murdered on the steps of the altar as he offered the sacrifice of the mass. Clovis fell later, as did one of his sisters and his mother Audowere.

The vision of the bishop thus came true : " After the synod of Paris," relates Gregory of Tours, " I had already said adieu to the king, and was ready to return home. But not wishing to go without greeting the Bishop of Albi, I went to find him, and did so in the courtyard of the manor of Braine. We went apart a little to talk with each other, and he said, ' Have you seen under this roof that which I have seen ? ' ' I have seen,' I answered, ' a second small building which the king has lately built under it.' ' Have you seen nothing else ? ' he asked. ' No,' I replied, and supposing that he spoke figuratively, I added, ' If you have seen anything else, tell me.' Then, sighing deeply, he said, ' I see the sword of God's anger drawn and suspended over this house.' And truly the words of the bishop were not false."

Chilperic himself was possibly one of the victims of Fredegonde. One evening on his return from hunting to his manor of Chelles, as he dismounted, resting one hand on the shoulder of one of his nobles, he was stabbed by Landeric, one of the queen's servants. Others accused Brunhilde of this crime (584).

This prince, whom Gregory of Tours calls a Nero and a Herod, none the less displayed in the midst of all his vices and barbarity a certain instinct for government and some literary tastes. He made verses, and though they were certainly poor, it must be concluded that he read the poets whom soon no one read at all. He admired the administrative order which the emperors had established, even though it is true that he borrowed

from them, especially their financial system. "King Chilperic," says Gregory of Tours, "caused rolls of new and very burdensome taxes to be prepared throughout his kingdom, with the result that many left their towns and abandoned their possessions. It was ordained that every proprietor should pay a pitcher of wine for every half acre of land. On other lands and on slaves many other contributions or levies were imposed which it was impossible to bear." By frequent revolts the people protested against this voracious financial system, a return to that which had destroyed the old empire. But it required family troubles and the death of many of their children to persuade the king and Fredegonde that the anger of Heaven had fallen on their house owing to these taxes: they then caused the rolls to be burned.

King Gontran.—But these murders alarmed the easy-going Gontran. "To put an end to this evil custom of killing kings, he went one day to the church where all the people were assembled at mass. Having had silence proclaimed by a deacon, he said, 'I adjure you, men and women who are here present, preserve unbroken faith towards me, and do not kill me as you have lately killed my brothers. Grant me three years in which to educate my nephews, lest after my death you and they will perish together, there being no man of my family strong enough to defend you.' At these words, all the people prayed to the Lord."

Between Fredegonde and Brunhilde, Gontran had reason to tremble. The former had entrusted him with the care of her son, the young Clotaire II., but he felt that he was surrounded by dangers on all sides. He feared Fredegonde, he feared Brunhilde, who had returned to Austrasia, where she secured complete ascendancy over her son. He feared the nobles who were daily more disinclined to submit to royal control. Presently a great plot was organised in the south. Aquitaine, which had remained wholly Roman, attempted to separate from the barbarous lands of the north and to create a king for itself, Gondowald. This adventurer, a reputed son of Clotaire I., perished after almost succeeding in his design (585).

Treaty of Andelot (587).—Another and more formidable plot was secretly formed among the nobles of Austrasia and Burgundy (587). They proposed to assassinate the two kings and then to divide the country. One of the assassins, captured as he was about to stab Gontran, revealed the plot. The conspirators perished, and among them a number of dukes and

counts. Childebert and Gontran, in alarm, had an interview at Andelot (in Haute-Marne, 20 kilometres north-east of Chaumont) in order to settle their differences. It was decided that the inheritance of either, if he died childless, should pass to the survivor, that the vassals should not be permitted to transfer their allegiance at will from one king to another, but on the other hand should be granted security of tenure in their lands. This was a first step towards the establishment of feudalism.

Power of Brunhilde in Austrasia and in Burgundy.—Gontran died in 593, and Childebert II., having united the two kingdoms, tried to seize that of Clotaire II., son of Fredegonde. His troops were defeated at Doissy near Soissons, and before he had time to recover from this reverse, sickness carried him off (596). His eldest son, Theudebert II., took Austrasia; the younger, Thierry II., took Burgundy. Brunhilde hoped to rule Austrasia in the name of her grandson as she had ruled it in the name of her son, but she had angered the Austrasians by attempting to introduce order into the state and to reduce the vassals to greater obedience. Feeling that she was hated by the nobles, she tried to preserve her power over her grandson by encouraging him to give way to every kind of excess. She was punished for this abominable scheme; those who shared in the young king's debauches expelled her (589).

Retiring to Burgundy to her other grandson, she continued to feel the same lust for power, though it is fair to add that with her imperious ambition there were mingled loftier views than those of the contemporary princes. She had a taste for arts and letters; unlike the rest of these Merovingians, she believed that a king should not merely enjoy the taxes paid by his subjects, but owed them in return the maintenance of good order and the undertaking of public works. She built churches, constructed roads, and recalled the memory of that Roman administration which she wished to restore. Unfortunately she considered that the end justified the means, and especially that it justified the favourite method of the time, assassination, by which all difficulties seemed to be so easily removed. Thus she caused St. Didier, Bishop of Vienne, to be stoned, because he tried to reclaim her grandson from those vices in which she encouraged him. She did not dare, however, to lay hands on St. Columbanus, an Irish monk, whose eloquence was equal to his courage, and who traversed Gaul recalling monks to their duty, and sometimes moving princes to humanity. As he vigorously reproached Thierry II. for his irregularities, she expelled him

from the monastery which he had founded at Luxeuil, in the midst of the wilds of the Vosges, and forced him to take ship on the Loire and return to his own land.

In the midst of these court intrigues, wars occurred between the peoples. The Neustrians were twice defeated by the Austrasians, at Droissy, near Soissons (593), and at Latofao, near Moret (596); they were utterly crushed by the Burgundians at Dormeilles, in Gatinais (600), and near Étampes (604), and Paris was taken. Clotaire II. was only saved by the King of Austrasia who negotiated with him. Brunhilde, furious at seeing a vengeance which she had pursued for twenty years escape from her, turned upon Theudebert. She persuaded Thierry to attack him, but his vassals refused to fight. In 610 war did break out between the two, and Theudebert, defeated, was put to death with his children; his brother hardly outlived him (613).

Plot of the Nobles against Brunhilde: Her Terrible Death (613). —No grown males were left to reign in Austrasia: there were only four children and their great-grandmother Brunhilde. The nobles were disturbed at the thought of being at the mercy of this imperious woman, and a plot was secretly organised against her. She despatched the armies of her two realms against Clotaire II., and counted on a certain victory, but was delivered by her own soldiers into the hands of the son of her implacable enemy. He charged her with having caused the death of ten kings, handed her over for three days to the insults of his army, and then bound her to the tail of a wild horse. The four sons of Thierry II. had already been murdered, and Clotaire II. found himself, as his grandfather and namesake had done, sole King of the Franks (613). The horrible Fredegonde, his mother, had already died "full of years" in 597.

CHAPTER IX

STATE OF GAUL IN THE SIXTH CENTURY

Disorder and Gloom of the Period. — Mankind has passed through few such unhappy periods as the sixth and seventh centuries of the Christian era. The indiscipline and brutal violence of the barbarians, the absence of all order, the revival of old quarrels between town and town, district and district, and above all a species of return to the state of nature, may be

traced clearly in the writings of this unhappy age. Men lived in constant dread of pillage and arson, of unexpected attacks and murder. Over and above the evil resulting from violence, there was thus a feeling of perpetual unrest from the expectation of further violence, the barbarians having as little scruple in taking the liberty as in appropriating the goods of the conquered. When Chilperic sent his daughter to Spain to marry the King of the Visigoths he took from Paris a great number of its inhabitants of high rank, whom he compelled, whether they would or no, to leave their homes and families to form an escort for the princess. Every year these barbarian kings made war; every year they made peace. The number of hostages thus constantly increased, and it was always the sons of wealthy Gallo-Romans who were reduced to slavery on each side directly a rupture occurred. The history of one such hostage, Attalus, has already been recorded.

To complete the picture of these dreadful days, it may be added that the development of civilisation entirely ceased; that the Latin language was corrupted in these barbarous lips; that neither kings nor chiefs, no one not engaged in the service of the Church or in municipal administration, troubled to learn to read or write. Civilisation declined, and seemed to be on the point of vanishing beneath the ruins caused by the barbarians.

Fredegar, who continued the historical labours of Gregory of Tours, recognised with sorrow the growing progress of barbarism. The pious bishop was himself uncultured, and asked pardon for his errors of style, but he had at least the spirit of learning. "I pray," says Fredegar, "that a portion of like eloquence may have fallen to me and that I may be in some measure like him. But it is hard to draw water from a dry well. The world grows old, the sword of wisdom is blunted; no one now living can emulate the orators of bygone ages; none dare attempt to do so."

Three Forms of Society in Gaul.—When the invasion had passed over Gaul, shattering its ancient bonds and introducing new political and social ideas as it filled the country with new races, three classes of society are to be found existing, of which one served as a link between the other two: the Gallo-Romans, the barbarians, and between them, recruited from each, the Church.

The Clergy: Importance of the Position of the Bishops.—The Church had met the barbarians half way; she overcame her conquerors, drew them to the foot of the altar, and forced them to bow their heads before her word and beneath her hand. But

from contact with barbarism, she herself acquired a certain element of ruthlessness. Germans and Franks aspired to the honours of the episcopate and introduced into her churches manners hitherto unknown in them. The great intellectual movement which had formerly inspired religious society was interrupted and ceased; darkness fell upon the Church herself. But the clergy still preserved some traces of ancient culture, some literary instinct, and if clerical wisdom declined, clerical influence increased in the cities, where the bishop was the true ruler; over the kings, who drew their ablest advisers from the ranks of the clergy; over the nobles, who purchased her prayers by lavish donations, preferring to do penance by giving lands to the Church rather than by setting a good example to their men. Armed with the power of excommunication, the bishops could inspire the most violent of men, even kings, with salutary fear, and they added material to moral power when they secured from Clotaire I. or Clotaire II. the right to hear, concurrently with the count or governor of the city, cases of theft, treason, and arson.

The intervention of the clergy in secular affairs was fortunate; their courts were superior to those of the barbarian in intelligence, impartiality, and humanity. They were, indeed, the leaders of civilisation, and the eighty-three councils held in Gaul from the beginning of the sixth to the middle of the eighth century testify not only to the practical activity and fervent zeal of the clergy, but also to their desire to effect an amelioration of manners and to reorganise society upon a basis of greater justice and less inequality. If the Council of Macon (585) enforced the payment of a tithe of all produce to the ministers of the Church, under penalty of perpetual excommunication, yet it was the Church alone that cared for the poor in this age. The Council of Lyons (583) decreed that in every town a lazarette should be built, where the lepers were nourished and cared for at the expense of the Church. The Council of Châlons (644) forbade the selling of Christian slaves out of the kingdom, and the fathers added, "Religion demands that Christians should be freed entirely from the bonds of slavery." The Assembly of Orleans (511) had granted the right of sanctuary to churches; this right, an abuse in a time of peace, order, and justice, was valuable in an epoch in which the weak were at the mercy of the strong. The Church boldly undertook the protection of the afflicted. She called to her the widow, the orphan, the poor, and the outlaw, and it was because she had with her all the feeble that she was

so strong, for the feeble and the oppressed were in those days almost the whole population.

Monasteries.—Side by side with the churches, monasteries arose. St. Martin introduced into the west that ascetic life which St. Anthony had first practised in the third century in the east and in the desert of the Thebaid. He founded the monastery of Ligugem, eight kilometres from Poitiers, and later that of Marmoutiers, near Tours. About the same time the monastery of L'Ile Barbe was built below Lyons, and at the beginning of the fifth century that of St. Victor at Marseilles, the two last long remaining famous. Thenceforward, monasteries rapidly increased, and by the sixth century there were already some two hundred and thirty-eight houses. The monks lived without any universal rule ; some gave themselves up to an excess of piety, which was more curious than edifying. An example is supplied by the pillar-saint of Treves, who stood upright and barefooted, summer and winter, on the top of a pillar, from which the bishops of the district with great difficulty induced him to descend. About 530, however, St. Benedict of Nursia drew up for the monks of Mont Casino a rule which was soon adopted throughout Gaul. This rule was sane ; it forbade useless self-torture, and divided the time of the monks between prayer, bodily exercise, and spiritual labours ; it enjoined the cultivation of the earth, but also the reading and copying of manuscripts. "Every letter written is a wound inflicted on the devil," said an abbot. A tiny lamp of literature was thus kept burning within the monasteries, and it was thence that it later shone through society, when society had recovered enough security and leisure to be able to think once more.

"An abbey was not only a place of prayer and meditation, but was also an ever-open refuge against the attacks of barbarism in all its forms. This refuge of books and learning contained workshops of all kinds, and its branches formed a definite model on which to build. In it were found examples of industry and activity for the labourer, artisan, and landowner. It was the school which taught those of the conquerors whom an enlightened self-interest led to undertake on their lands great enterprises in the way of cultivation or colonisation, the second of which was the necessary outcome of the first." (Thierry.)

The Gallo-Romans: Transference of Influence from the Towns to the Rural Districts.—The barbarians had overthrown the central government of the empire, but not the internal organisation of the towns. A Frank arrived in each as count, to

represent the king, and to receive the imposts which the Gallo-Romans continued to pay, and to administer justice. The conquered race preserved, however, their *curias* and magistrates, the use of Roman law and those institutions which in a great number of towns survived throughout the Middle Ages. But the continual presence of a Frankish count, invested with all the powers of a king, greatly impaired municipal liberties which in all other respects were increased. The inhabitants of towns regained the right to bear arms, of which the Romans had deprived them. Gallo-Roman society contained three main classes, the free landed proprietors, the colonists attached to the soil who cultivated the land, and domestic or agricultural slaves. According to the penal code of the Franks, the life of a Gallo-Roman was valued only at half that of a barbarian. The free Gallo-Romans lived mainly in the cities, according to the habits of Greek and Roman society, the rich on their revenues, the poor on the scanty industry which still existed. The barbarians, on the other hand, disdained to live in towns, preferring to remain, as they had been while beyond the Rhine, in the open air under great trees and at the edge of the hunting ground. The richest Gallo-Roman landowners followed the example of the masters of the land ; they left the *triclinium* and the crowns of flowers, the perfumed baths and soft couches of the East, the poet and parasite who entertained them at their feasts, the games of the circus and the discussions of the courts which occupied their leisure, to engage in long hunts, rowdy orgies, and rough freedom of the barbarians. An important revolution was thus accomplished. The superiority which in ancient times had belonged to the cities passed to the rural districts, where the aristocracy was established, and the Middle Ages, in place of that municipal life in which civilisation and liberty developed, saw the reign of castles and of the landed nobility, which everywhere displayed brilliant military qualities, but which also for centuries held the peasant bent to his plough, the artisan to his last, in misery, ignorance, and servitude.

The Barbarians: Condition of Lands and Persons: Wergild.—After the conquest, the Franks appropriated a large part of the land of Gaul. Their new possessions, free from all taxes and binding their owners only to the duty of military service in national wars, formed the freehold of the warrior, and were known as allodial estates. Kings and influential chiefs who had reserved for themselves considerable domains further paid for the services of their *fideles* or *leudes*, their immediate followers,

with lands which were at first granted for life, but which, after the Treaty of Andelot (587), were handed over in perpetuity in most instances. To this grant, the obligation of military service and the performance of certain duties towards the grantor were attached, in return for the protection assured to vassals towards and against all others. These lands, guaranteed to their holders but yet dependent on superior lords, formed the "benefices." "Tributary lands" were those which the Franks left to the former proprietors on condition of the payment of a rent in money or kind.

The community was divided into three main classes. 1. The *free men*, who were subdivided into two classes, the allodial proprietors who owed nothing to any individual, but who were obliged to make certain gifts to the king, and who were bound to serve the state in national wars; and the leudes, who held benefices and who were obliged to perform certain duties towards those whose land they held. The royal leudes, from the ranks of whom the king always selected the dukes and counts whom he employed to command armies and to govern provinces and towns, were those who had received their holding directly from the king. These royal leudes, living in constant intercourse with the king, secured from him considerable domains, and with those chiefs who had enough land to distribute some to their men, formed an aristocracy, the power and pretensions of which daily increased.

2. The *lites*, who may be identified with the Roman *colonus*: they could not be arbitrarily deprived of the land which they farmed, and for which they paid to a proprietor a fixed rent.

3. The *slaves*, who did not retain that personal liberty which was still recognised as belonging to the lites and coloni.

In the penal system of the barbarians, according to which compensation or *wergild* (forfeit) might be made for every crime from murder to theft, the life of a Gallo-Roman was always reckoned at half the value of the life of a Frank.

Some examples may be given of this curious social hierarchy, determined according to the price of blood, a species of estimate which, being applied to a society wholly given over to every brutal passion, became a rule.

	sols.
For the murder of a free barbarian, a companion or leude of the king, slain in his house by an armed band, among the Salians	1800

	sols.
A duke among the Bavarians, a bishop among the Alemanni	960
A bishop among the Ripuarians, a Roman, being a king's leude among the Salians	900
The relatives of a duke among the Bavarians	640
All royal leudes, a count, a priest born free, a free-born judge	600
A deacon among the Ripuarians	500
A deacon among the Alemanni and Salians	400
A free Salian or Ripuarian	200
A free barbarian of other tribes	160
A slave who was a good goldsmith	150
A Roman owning land, a German lite, a slave who was a silver-smith	100
A freedman	80
A barbarian slave	55
A slave who was a blacksmith	50
The slave of a church on the king's demesne, a Roman tributary	45
A swineherd	30
A slave among the Bavarians	20

Government: Character of the Frankish Monarchy: The King: Counts and Dukes: National Assemblies: Mayors of the Palace.—Kingship was at the same time elective and hereditary, for while the king was elected the choice fell always upon some member of the Merovingian family. The kings were often known as the "long-haired kings." To cut their hair was to depose them. "A Frankish king was deprived of his long locks as an emperor of his crown," says Chateaubriand: "the Germans, in their simplicity made the natural crown of a man the outward sign of authority." Beyond the Rhine, kings had only possessed a very limited authority. After the conquest, the Gallo-Romans, and more especially the bishops, tried to instil into these princes some ideas of order and administration. The land was divided into counties and the counties into centuries. In each of the old Gallo-Roman cities, a royal officer, the count, administered justice concurrently with the bishop, for whose hearing certain cases were reserved. Franks, Gallo-Romans, Burgundians, and Visigoths were judged by the count, but according to their special law and customs. The count received public revenues and assembled the levy of free

men whom he led to the army. Sometimes several cities were united under the control of a duke, who, in this case, had several counts under his orders. Thus the barbarian kings showed less respect for municipal independence than the emperors had done. They even tried to restore the imperial financial system which had collapsed with the empire, but this attempt, in common with all those made by various kings and their ministers to introduce a modicum of order into this society, greatly offended the nobles, and more especially those of Austrasia, who were less familiar with Roman customs.

The Franks, indeed, had brought from Germany an idea which was unknown in the empire, that of the sovereignty of the people. Upon important matters, the king was obliged in early times to assemble a general council to which all free men were summoned (champ de Mars). At these assemblies, in memory of the ancient comradeship in arms which had existed in Germany, the Franks offered to their kings their annual gifts. In each county and century, free men formed the court of the count or centenier, in which justice was administered. These habits of liberty and equality accorded ill with the despotic principles of the imperial régime, and all who desired its return, Chilperic, Brunhilde, Ebroin, perished miserably.

Military Aristocracy.—But the defeat of attempted absolutism only profited the nobles, who gradually established in the midst of the nation a powerful nobility, which became more formidable when it secured a leader in the mayor of the palace. The king, who lived surrounded by a numerous crowd of leudes, had always disturbance and tumult around him. To produce order out of this chaos, he early appointed a major domo, or mayor of the palace, chosen by the nobles and having jurisdiction over all disputes which arose in the royal residence. At first he had charge only of the police of the palace and the command of the leudes; by degrees he assumed functions which the king would not exert himself to perform, and thus the mayor of the palace, more especially in Austrasia, forced the Merovingians to resign themselves to the position of *rois fainéants*.

Barbarian Laws.—Each German tribe had its own law. The codes of the Visigoths and Burgundians were greatly influenced by Roman law, under which the clergy and the Gallo-Romans lived. The laws of the Alemanni, Bavarians, Ripuarians, and Salians are preserved, and are distinguished from Roman law by three main characteristics. They formed a penal code, being only concerned with criminals, a proof of the extremely violent

state of society. In the second place, they permitted the expiation of every injury by compensation, a money payment (wergild), the amount of which varied mainly according to the rank of the injured person. Finally they admitted proof of facts by the testimony of a certain number of relatives or friends of the defendant or complainant. The judge was, however, able to order trial by battle, the judicial duel, and ordeals of cold water, boiling water, or red-hot iron. In the first case, the accused was thrown bound hand and foot into a tub of water, and was held to be guilty if he floated, on the ground that water, consecrated according to the rites of religion, could not receive into it anything impure. In the second case, he plunged his hand to the bottom of a vessel full of boiling water to take out a ring which the judge had thrown into it. If, after the lapse of a specified time, he showed no sign of scalding, he was acquitted. This was the judgment of God. The ordeal of hot iron was similar ; a bar of iron, heated red hot, had to be lifted and carried a certain distance ; if three days later the man's hand was without wound or if the wound was of a certain character, the accused was innocent. Torture and execution were punishments reserved for slaves and serfs convicted of a crime ; the free man was commonly obliged only to pay the wergild.

An example to the contrary may however be cited in the story of the result of a trial by battle recorded by Gregory of Tours. "In the twenty-ninth year of King Gontran, as that prince was hunting in the forest of the Vosges, he found the remains of a wild bull which had been killed. The ranger of the forest, asked who had dared to kill the beast in a royal forest, accused Chaudon, the king's chamberlain. Gontran had him bound and brought to Châlons where he was confronted with the accused, who denied his guilt. The king ordered a trial by battle, and as Chaudon was old, he put forward his nephew to fight in his place. The two enemies were matched in an enclosed field. The young man, vigorously attacking the ranger with his lance, pierced his foot and caused him to fall; he then fell on him to cut his throat with his dagger, but the ranger stabbed him in the stomach, and both lay dead together. At this sight, Chaudon fled in great haste to take sanctuary at the church of St. Marcel, but Gontran cried that he should be taken before he reached it, and having had him bound to a stake caused him to be stoned to death." Without mentioning the fact that the lives of three men were sacrificed for a wild bull by the most amiable of the Merovingians, there may be noted the right possessed by old

men and women of employing a substitute, and the fate which befell one whose champion was defeated.

Salic Law.—This famous law, the authenticity of which has, however, been disputed, is said to have been drawn up in Latin after the passage of the Rhine, but before the baptism of Clovis. It is prefaced by a passage written at a later date by some clerk of Frankish race, who clearly reveals the continued barbarism of this people in his writing, but also his sincere devotion to the Church. "Glory to Christ who loves the Franks, who guards their realm and fills their king with the light of His grace, who protects their army, who grants to them signs which prove the truth of our faith, who gives the joys of peace and happiness. May the Lord Jesus lead in the way of piety the hearts of those who govern, for this is the nation which, small in numbers, but brave and strong, freed itself from the yoke of the Romans, and which, after receiving the sanctification of baptism, sumptuously adorned with gold and precious stones the bodies of the holy martyrs whom the Romans had burned with fire, massacred, mutilated with the sword, or caused to be torn in pieces by wild beasts."

The most famous, and perhaps the most doubtful, provision of the Salic law laid down that a woman might not inherit salic or allodial land, for which a Frank owed military service. This prohibition was natural: at a later date the inheritance of the crown was assimilated with that of Salic land, and women were, in France, always excluded from the throne.

Disorganisation of Slavery.—Owing to the increasing progress of doctrines of morality, ancient slavery had already lost something of its severity, when the Church, preaching the dogma of human brotherhood and common redemption, struck a heavy blow against it. Enfranchisement increased, and the slave was less under the absolute power of his master. The invasion, which threw everything into confusion, also disorganised slavery, the more so since a condition so contrary to nature could be maintained only by severe legislation. The barbarian, a proud conqueror, drew no distinction between the toga and the tunic, between master and slave. In the general misery, the gap between them was reduced. Luxury disappeared and, as Germanic customs spread everywhere, domestic slaves became less numerous. Relegated to the rural districts, they approximated in condition to the coloni, and the majority became demesne serfs, adscript to the soil and owing definite labour in place of arbitrary service. This new class was recruited

from above and below. The slaves rose, the coloni and free men, having lost their all, descended. In the ninth and tenth centuries the revolution was complete ; few slaves remained, there were only serfs, though eight centuries more passed before this latter type of slavery was extinguished.

Story of Count Leudaste.—The adventurous story of a man who born in a humble position rose to the highest rank supplies a clearer picture of this barbarous society by showing it in actual operation.

Leudaste was born a serf of the royal household. Caribert's agent employed him in the lowest service of the palace, and at the first opportunity he fled. Three times he was retaken, each time he escaped again. Flogging and confinement had no effect upon him ; his ear was therefore cut off, and he was marked with a scar of indelible shame. Yet he saved himself. Caribert at this time married a servant of the palace, Markowefe, the daughter of a wool carder. Leudaste succeeded in interesting the new queen in the lot of her old companion in slavery. She gave him the care of her horses ; thence he rose to the position of count of the queen's stables, which placed him not only among the ranks of free men but on a level with Frankish nobles. The ability with which he exploited the favour of Markowefe enabled him to accumulate enough wealth to buy, by his presents to King Caribert, the rank of count of the royal stables and later that of Count of Tours.

Leudaste then believed that he might do what he would ; he was guilty of exactions, violence, and outrages. The death of Caribert freed the people from this scourge ; Tours fell to the share of Sigebert, and Leudaste went to live in the palace of Chilperic, where he tried to secure over Fredegonde an ascendancy similar to that which he had possessed over Markowefe (567). Five years later, a native of Auvergne of noble birth was chosen Bishop of Tours by the clergy and people of that town, whose affection he had gained during a pilgrimage to the tomb of St. Martin. He was the grave and pious personage to whom we owe so many valuable details of this period, the historian of the Franks, St. Gregory of Tours. King Sigebert confirmed this happy choice. Gregory, thanks to his birth, his strong and serious character, and his office, soon secured a considerable influence, even beyond the walls of his episcopal town. When the troops of Chilperic entered the city in 574, Leudaste was restored to his office, but owing to the presence of Gregory, showed some restraint for a time. The murder of Sigebert,

however, freed him from all fear and gave him assurance; he began again those violences and cruelties which had marked his former tenure of office. When he sat as judge, he often abused the suitor and even the audience; he threw priests into chains and struck Frankish warriors with his staff. At such times the former serf made no distinction between conquerors and conquered. As for right, that obviously consisted as far as he was concerned in ability to bribe him.

Gregory bore his violent conduct in patience for two years. Then a deputation sent secretly from Tours revealed everything to King Chilperic; Leudaste after an inquiry was deprived of his office. Forthwith he vowed eternal hatred against the bishop who had driven him out and Fredegonde who had failed to support him. He formed a plan for the destruction of both; he arranged with a priest Rikulf, who aimed at Gregory's position, and with a sub-deacon of the same name who had some different aim in view, to go to Chilperic and to accuse the bishop of designing to hand over Tours to the King of Austrasia and spreading defamatory reports about Fredegonde. The king's anger at this double revelation was extreme, and he demanded that Leudaste should produce his evidence. The ex-count named two friends of Gregory, who, he said, would speak if put to the torture, and the sub-deacon Rikulf who would speak voluntarily.

Leudaste hoped that Chilperic would exhibit in this matter all the violence of his barbaric passions and that, content with his evidence and that of Rikulf, he would, without any further information, expel Fredegonde and disgrace the bishop. But between Fredegonde and Chilperic there were ties of affection and of crimes which were not easy to break. Informed of the charge brought against her, she had enough influence over Chilperic to secure that the matter should be fully examined calmly and deliberately. She felt that she had an enemy and was determined to find him. A synod of all the bishops of Neustria was assembled in the royal manor of Braine to judge Gregory.

When the synod opened, the whole Gallo-Roman population of the district hastened to bear witness to its sympathy for the bishop, and the Franks themselves saluted him with respect. Berthram, Bishop of Bordeaux, explained the facts of the case, and asked Gregory whether it was true that he had made imputations against the queen's honour. "In truth I have said nothing of the kind," answered the Bishop of Tours.

The slight murmur of satisfaction which these words caused

in the court became stamping and shouting outside. Despite the king's presence, the Frank vassals, strangers to the Roman idea of royal majesty and of the sanctity of judicial proceedings, suddenly intervened in the discussion with remarks characterised by a rough freedom of language. "Why are such charges brought against a priest of God?—How is it that the king pays attention to such a matter?—Is a bishop to be held capable of saying such things on the mere report of a slave?—Lord God, bring help to thy servant." At these cries of opposition, the king rose, but without anger, being well acquainted with the brutal licence of his leudes. Raising his voice that the crowd outside might hear his apology, he said to the assembly, "The charge made against my wife is an outrage on me, and I am bound to resent it. If you think it well that witnesses to the charge against the bishop should be produced, they are here present, but if it seems to you that it should not be done, and that the good faith of the bishop may be trusted, say so; I will gladly do what you ordain."

The bishops, delighted and a little astonished by such moderation and docility in King Chilperic, at once allowed him to call the witnesses to the charge, whose presence he had announced; only one, the Sub-Deacon Rikulf, appeared. The two friends of Gregory whom Leudaste had named persisted in declaring that they knew nothing. As for Leudaste, taking advantage of his liberty and of the disorder which had marked the institution of these proceedings, he had not only not come to the hearing, but had further taken the precaution of going far away from the scene of these debates. Rikulf, bold to the end, was ready to speak, but the members of the synod checked him, crying on all sides, "A clerk of inferior rank cannot be believed in a matter of justice against a bishop."

As proof by witness was thus destroyed, there was nothing left but to rely upon the word and oath of the bishop. The king, true to his promise, raised no objection to this method of procedure, but he was guilty of deceit as to the form in which the oath should be taken. Whether from mere caprice, or from some vague memory of old Germanic superstition which survived under Christian forms, he decided that the justification of Bishop Gregory should be accompanied by strange acts which might be regarded as supplying some sort of magical proof. He demanded that the bishop should say mass three times in succession at different altars, and that at the end of each mass, on the

steps of the altar, should swear that he had never said the words attributed to him.

The three masses were said and the three oaths taken at the three altars. Soon afterwards the council reassembled. Chilperic had already taken his place, but the president of the assembly remained standing, and said with majestic gravity, "King, the bishop has done all that was prescribed: his innocence is proved: what have we to do? It remains for us to deprive of Christian communion you and Berthram, the accuser of one of his brothers." Struck by this unexpected sentence, the king changed colour, and with the confused air of a schoolboy who would cast the blame for a fault upon his accomplices, answered, "But I have not mentioned one thing which I must say." "Who first mentioned the charge to you?" asked the president, with an air of the most absolute authority. "It was from Leudaste that I have learned all," said the king, trembling lest his ears should hear the terrible sentence of excommunication.

An order was at once given that Leudaste should be brought to the bar of the assembly, but he was found neither in the palace nor in the neighbourhood; he had wisely escaped. The bishops resolved to proceed against him for contumacy, and to declare him excommunicate. When the deliberation was closed, the president of the council arose and pronounced the anathema, according to the consecrated forms:—"By the judgment of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, in virtue of the power granted to the apostles and to their successors of binding and loosing in Heaven and on earth, we all together do decree that Leudaste, the sower of scandal, the accuser of the queen, the false accuser of a bishop, having withdrawn from the hearing of this case that he might evade judgment, shall henceforth be separated from the bosom of Holy Mother Church, and excluded from all Christian communion. In the present life and in the life to come no Christian shall greet him or kiss him, no priest shall celebrate mass for him or administer to him the Holy Communion of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ; no one shall associate with him or receive him into his house, or deal with him on any matter, or drink or eat with him, or speak with him, save it be to urge him to repentance. Let him be cursed in the name of God the Father who created man; let him be cursed in the name of God the Son who suffered for man; let him be cursed in the name of God the Holy Ghost who comes to us in baptism. Let him be cursed in the name of all the saints

who since the foundation of the world have found grace with God. Let him be cursed wheresoever he may be found, in his house or in the fields, on the road or in his secret chamber; let him be cursed in living and dying, in waking and sleeping, in working and resting. Let him be cursed in all the powers and organs of his body; let him be cursed in all parts of his members, so that from the crown of his head to the soles of his feet there may not be the least whole part in him; let him be delivered to damnation with Dathan and Abiram, with those who said to the Lord, 'Depart from us'; as the fire is extinguished by water, so let his light be put out for evermore, if he does not repent and come to make satisfaction." At these last words, all the members of the assembly who had listened so far in complete silence, together raised their voices and cried many times, "Amen, so let it be; let him be anathema. Amen, amen."

Judgment was then passed on Rikulf who was condemned to death. At the prayer of Gregory, Chilperic spared his life, but before allowing him to pass out of her power, Fredegonde caused him to be cruelly tortured. "I do not believe," says the Bishop of Tours, "that any inanimate object, any metal, could have resisted all the blows with which this unhappy being was afflicted." From the third hour to the ninth he remained hanging from a tree with his hands bound behind his back; at the ninth, he was taken down and stretched on a wooden horse, where he was flogged with sticks, whips, and doubled straps, and that not by one or two men, but by as many as could reach his wretched body, all took part in this work and struck him.

In the midst of these tortures, Rikulf confessed the whole plot. They had hoped to banish the queen and her two sons, so that Clovis, Chilperic's eldest son, might inherit the throne; Leudaste would then have become a duke, the first man in the state after the king. Fredegonde never forgot the destiny which Leudaste had intended for her husband's son.

Leudaste, however, fled in disguise. He reached Tours before the sentence passed on him was known, collected all his riches, and retired into Berry, which belonged to Gontran. But at the first village through which he passed, the sight of his burdened waggons excited the greed of the inhabitants. The judge of the district put himself at the head of the people, and all the treasure was taken. Some time afterwards he himself fell into the hands of the soldiers who were searching for him, and his only resource was to take sanctuary at St. Hilary of Poitiers. After the delight of finding himself in safety, he wearied of his refuge in this holy

place. There were there many outlaws, and these he organised into bands which from time to time ranged into the town, robbed one or two houses, and then returned to enjoy in the church the fruits of their rapine. Scandalous orgies, games, blasphemies, and quarrels occurred there, and at last he was expelled as unworthy of the protection of the saint.

For two years he vanished from view, until the friends whom he had at the court of Neustria obtained leave from the king and bishops for him to return to his house at Tours. But Leudaste was not a man to profit from experience. His return of good fortune did not seem to him to be complete, and he went to the court of Neustria to recover the favour of the king. For some while Chilperic avoided him ; at last, giving way to his insistence, he consented to see him, but advised him to act cautiously where the queen was concerned. The advice was good ; Leudaste took no notice of it. One Sunday, when the king and queen were together at mass in the cathedral at Paris, Leudaste went to the church, passed with a bold air through the crowd which surrounded the royal seat, and prostrating himself before Fredegonde, who was far from expecting to see him, begged her to pardon him.

At this sudden apparition of a man whom she hated mortally, and who appeared to have come less to implore pardon than to brave her anger, the queen was seized by a most violent access of spite. The colour mounted to her face, tears rolled from her eyes, and throwing a glance of bitter disdain at her husband, who sat unmoved beside her, she cried, " Since I have no son to whom I can commit the duty of avenging my wrongs, I entrust that duty to thee, Lord Jesus." Then to make a last appeal to the conscience of him who ought to have protected her, she threw herself at the king's feet, saying with an expression of lively grief and wounded dignity, " Woe is me that I see my enemy, and can do nothing against him."

The king ordered that Leudaste should be expelled from the church. Instead of flying in all haste, he told himself that the queen's anger might be appeased by presents, and waited in the shops which were near the church to select stuffs and jewels for her. He was still there when the queen came out of the church. She saw him, and scarcely entering the palace, sent some men to secure his person for her. He wounded one, and though himself severely wounded by a sword cut on the head, escaped. But as he was crossing the bridge of the city, his foot slipped, he broke his leg, and was seized. The king and queen long debated

in order to find a method of execution which should satisfy them. Weakened by the loss of blood which he had suffered, he could not bear prolonged torture. They called in able doctors, in order that he might be made well enough to suffer, but his wounds mortified. When Fredegonde knew this, she caused him to be dragged from his bed, stretched on the pavement, the nape of his neck resting against a great bar of iron; then a man armed with another bar struck at his throat until he gave up the ghost.

In this story it appears that, despite difference of race, a Roman, even a serf, could, thanks to the general disorganisation, take rank among the Frankish nobles; that the bishops had an important position in civil society; that the Church sometimes paid dearly for the sanctuary which she offered to all outlaws by the scandals which they caused; and especially there appears the implacable hatred of Fredegonde. We cannot draw an equally clear picture of Chilperic, reading his halting verses to Gregory of Tours, or discussing with him the doctrines of the Trinity; trying to introduce new letters into the Roman alphabet, to render the gutteral accent of German; trembling before his wife and his soldiers, who pillaged friend and foe alike wherever they went.

CHAPTER X

CLOTAIRE II. AND DAGOBERT, SOLE KINGS OF THE FRANKS: ANARCHY AFTER THEIR TIME (613–687)

Clotaire II., Sole King (613–628).—As a result of the death of Brunhilde and of the children of Thierry II., the son of Fredegonde at last became sole king. The heritage of Clovis was once more ostensibly united, but the mayors of the palace of Burgundy and Austrasia compelled the king to swear that he would not deprive them of their offices, and that he would not interfere with the election of their successors, which was to be exclusively in the hands of the *leudes*.

Perpetual Constitution of 615.—In 615, however, a vigorous attempt was made to organise the Frankish monarchy. Seventy-nine bishops assembled at Paris with the *leudes* of the three realms, and the king confirmed by an edict, or perpetual constitution, the decisions of this body. The election of bishops was reserved to the clergy and people of the dioceses, the king

only having the right of confirming the election, after which the metropolitan should consecrate the elect. Clerks were to be judged only by their bishops. The direct taxes, introduced by Chilperic, Fredegonde, and Brunhilde, were abolished, but tolls levied on roads and at the entrances of towns were retained. The judges of counties were to be elected always from the landed proprietors of the district, a measure favourable to the aristocracy, since by it the greater landowners were invested with judicial power, which at that time included all others.

The provisions of this constitution were very largely directed against monarchical authority for the benefit of the dual ecclesiastical and military aristocracy which was arising. "The king," it was declared, "shall not establish any new tax. He shall not enter upon the inheritance of those who die intestate, but shall allow it to pass to the lawful heirs. He shall not in future permit the removal from monasteries of wealthy widows and religious women by those who wish to appropriate their property by forcing them into marriage. He shall restore to the *leudes* all that they may have lost in the recent troubles. He shall not receive appeals from ecclesiastical courts, but shall preserve their entire independence."

Obscurity of the Reign of Clotaire II.—The contemporary chroniclers knew nothing of the reign of Clotaire II., though they describe him as "gentle and kindly to all men, learned in letters, fearing God, a munificent patron of churches, the benefactor of the priests and of the poor; only giving himself with too much ardour to hunting and to seeking pleasure, for which cause he was blamed by his nobles." But it must not be supposed that the days of barbarism had passed. "The Saxons having rebelled," says another chronicler, "he so utterly subdued them by arms that he caused all the males of that race who were taller than the length of his sword to be put to death. He desired that the lasting memory of this fatal sword should destroy the daring of their children." This supplied an example of conduct sufficiently vigorous, but there is reason to believe that the sword of Clotaire II. was not always so terrible.

Dagobert, King of Austrasia (622).—In 622, Clotaire made his son, Dagobert, King of the Austrasians, under the regency of the mayor of the palace, Pippin of Landen, or Pippin the Old, and of St. Arnulf, Bishop of Metz. These two men, the ancestors of the Carolingian house, were related by the marriage of their children; Anseghis, son of Arnulf, married a daughter of Pippin of Landen, and from this union was born Pippin d'Heristal.

Dagobert, who succeeded his father in 628, was the mightiest of the Merovingian kings, and has remained the most popular figure among the rulers of that dynasty. "He was a prince," says his biographer, "terrible towards rebels and traitors, wielding the sceptre firmly, and rising like a lion in his wrath against the disturbers of the peace." Under him the Gascons, or Basques, who lived south of the Garonne, were defeated and promised obedience, though in actual fact that obedience proved to be somewhat illusory. Judicaël, Duke of the Bretons, came to the royal manor of Clichy to make submission. Beyond the Rhine, the majority of the Frisians and Saxons paid tribute; the Thuringians, Alemanni, and Bavarians humbly accepted the government of Dagobert. The Frankish dominion extended from the Weser to the Pyrenees, and from the Atlantic to the frontiers of Bohemia. Dagobert appeared as the foremost of all the barbarian rulers established within the limits of the old western empire. He was allied with the emperors of Constantinople; he intervened in the affairs of the Visigoths of Spain, to whom he gave a king; in those of the Lombards of Italy, whom he obliged to respect their queen, Gondeberga, his relative, and to attack the Wends, his foes. And it was within Frankish territory that the fugitive Bulgarians found a refuge.

In his internal government, Dagobert devoted himself to the administration of justice. He travelled through his dominions to repress disorder. "His advent," says Fredegar, "struck terror into the bishops and nobles, but filled the poor with joy." He reduced the laws of his barbarian subjects to writing and even recovered from the churches and monasteries many of the estates which they had usurped from the royal demesne. But he was liberal towards the clergy. He transferred to the church of St. Martin the impost due from the city of Tours, and to the monastery of Wissembourg part of lower Alsace, the inhabitants of which were to pay taxes to the abbot alone. At this time, public taxes were tending more and more to become private levies, and during the whole feudal period taxes in the strict sense were really unknown.

Dagobert founded the abbey of St. Denis, where the majority of the French kings after his time were buried; he encouraged such arts as still existed and displayed a luxury unknown to his barbarous predecessors. His mildness won him the epithet of the Frankish Solomon, and the name of the goldsmith, St. Eligius, his minister, is inseparably united with his own.

Signs of Approaching Decay.—The reign of Dagobert, which

was a period of rest between the epoch of conquest and that of decline, saw the beginnings of decay. The king was forced to hand over the larger part of Aquitaine to his brother Caribert. Ten thousand Bulgarian families took refuge in Bavaria, and he was unable to deliver himself from them except by ordering their massacre. The Wends, established in Bohemia and Moravia, pillaged Frankish merchants and refused reparation. Dagobert sent an Austrasian army against them; it was defeated, and the savages plundered Thuringia with impunity. During his life, and still more after his death, rebellions increased. The Saxons refused tribute, the Thuringians revolted, the Frisians created a duke for themselves, and the Bavarians and Alemanni only rendered a purely nominal obedience. Even in the interior of Gaul, Frankish dominion was pushed back upon the Loire. The descendants of Caribert ruled in the Garonne valley, where their posterity was represented by the dukes of Gascony and Aquitaine and by the counts of Armagnac. Southern Burgundy also created its own national chiefs, and in the districts which held to their allegiance the kings found themselves confronted by all-powerful officials who despoiled them of their authority.

The Mayors of the Palace.—The mayors of the palace have already been mentioned as judges of all the disputes which occurred in the royal palace. Gradually they became the leaders of the *leudes*, the aristocracy, and at the same time the chief ministers of the kings. In 613, when the nobles handed over Brunhilde to the son of Fredegonde, the mayors of the palace took care to provide for their own interests. "Warnachaire," says Fredegar, "was made mayor of the palace in Burgundy, and received an oath from the king that he should never be deprived. Radon, mayor of Austrasia, Gondelaud of Neustria, received the same promise." Not only did the mayorality of the palace become a life office, but in Austrasia it became also hereditary, with the result that the functions of monarchy fell into the power of the mayor, while the title of king remained to the representative of the Merovingian dynasty.

The Sons of Dagobert (638–656).—When Dagobert died (638), his two sons were still children. One, Sigebert II., reigned in Austrasia under the guardianship of Pippin of Landen as mayor; the other, Clovis II., reigned under the guardianship of Erkinoald in Neustria and of Flaochat in Burgundy. Sigebert died in 656, and Grimoald, son of Pippin and his successor as mayor of Austrasia, believed himself to be sufficiently assured of the support of the nobles to make his own son king. He caused

Dagobert, the rightful heir of Sigebert II., a boy of three years, to be carried across to Ireland and shut up in a monastery, and produced a forged will by which the late king adopted and appointed as heir to his kingdom the son of Grimoald. But the blood of the Merovingians still commanded respect; Clovis II. overthrew the usurper and reunited the whole monarchy (656), though he died in the same year.

Associated with his name is the legend of the "imbeciles of Jumièges." According to it, Clovis II., having defeated his two sons who had revolted against him, rendered them imbecile by causing their hamstrings to be burned. This punishment did not kill them. But from this time they were lunatics without vital force, and as they languished under their father's eyes, he was struck by remorse and shame. One day he ordered them to be placed in a boat on the Seine and left to the current to be carried where God would. The stream bore them as far as the peninsula upon which St. Philibert had founded the monastery of Jumièges. The monks received the imbeciles, and for long showed their tomb. They are a veritable symbol of the Merovingian race, prematurely exhausted in mind and in body, guarded and received by the Church.

Ebroïn, Mayor of the Palace (659–681): His Struggle against the Nobles and against Austrasia: St. Leger.—The eldest of the three sons of Clovis II. was four years old. The mayor, Erkinoald, left the monarchy undivided between them. The eldest, Clotaire III., seemed to reign under the tutelage of his mother, Queen Bathilda, an Anglo-Saxon slave whom pirates had sold on the Frankish coasts. Bathilda did not forget her origin, and during the ten years of her power she laboured to improve the lot of the slaves and the poor. But the nobles opposed this government of a woman whom they found always surrounded by bishops. In 664 they murdered her chief adviser, the Bishop of Paris, and Bathilda retired into the monastery of Chelles which she had built.

Erkinoald died in 659 and Ebroïn took his place. He was an ambitious and talented man, who proposed to revive the power of the monarchy, the authority of which was in his own hands, since there were then only children on the throne, Clotaire III., in Neustria and Burgundy, and since 660 Childeric II. in Austrasia. The *leudes* had their wish, kings without power; aristocracy and anarchy were triumphant. Ebroïn aimed at putting an end to the turbulence of the nobles. Some he exiled, some he condemned to forfeiture, many were put to death.

With a rare sense of government, he refused to confer the position of dukes and counts upon those who were possessed of considerable property in the districts which they desired to govern.

On the death of Clotaire III. in 670, in place of assembling at least the chief men of the monarchy for the purpose of proclaiming a new king, Ebroïn placed on the throne by his sole authority a third son of Clovis II., Thierry III. Thus the power of the mayor of the palace, which the nobles had so strengthened that it might aid them against monarchy, was now used against them, Ebroïn reviving the schemes of Brunhilde against the Frankish aristocracy. That aristocracy was not prepared to abandon the position which it had gained. In the three kingdoms, the *leudes* and bishops armed against Ebroïn, under the direction of St. Leger, Bishop of Autun. Surprised by a sudden attack, the mayor had time neither to defend himself nor to fly. He and his king were taken, tonsured, and confined as monks, Thierry at St. Denis, Ebroïn at Luxeuil; Childeric II. of Austrasia became sole king (670).

But civil war soon broke out again. St. Leger offended the Austrasian nobles, who attacked and deposed him, confining him in the same place which served as a prison for Ebroïn. The two enemies were reconciled for a moment. The death of Childeric II., murdered with his wife and son by a noble of Neustria whom he had caused to be flogged, opened the gates of Luxeuil for the prisoners (673).

Such general confusion reigned that men said the coming of Antichrist was drawing near. Ebroïn, as the abler of the two, was the first to reconstruct his position from this chaos. He renewed the conflict in the name of Clovis, an alleged son of Clotaire III., caused Leger to be blinded and afterwards executed, a fate which eventually gained for the bishop the honour of canonisation (678). He then abandoned his pretender and restored Thierry III.

Ebroïn had subdued the aristocracy in Neustria and Burgundy, but that of Austrasia was less easy to defeat. After the violent death of Dagobert II., assassinated in 679, the nobles of Austrasia abandoned kings who were either unable to protect them or were merely oppressive, and gave to their mayor, Martin, and to his cousin, Pippin d'Heristal, both of whom were grandsons of Pippin of Landen and Bishop Arnulf, the title of Duke of the Franks. Many Neustrian nobles fled to Austrasia, from which state an army set out in 680 to attack Ebroïn. But it was

defeated at Leucofao in Laonnais, and Martin, beguiled to a conference, was treacherously killed by Ebroïn. The Neustrian mayor of the palace was himself assassinated in the following year, and with him fell the last defender of Merovingian royalty.

Battle of Testry (687) : Final Fall of the Kings of the First Dynasty and of the Neustrian Franks : Ascendancy of the Austrasian or Ripuarian Franks.—Berthaire, who attempted to carry on the work of Ebroïn, had neither his energy nor his talents. When Pippin demanded that he should reinstate the Neustrian nobles who had taken refuge in Austrasia, he answered that he would go and search for them in person and set out with a numerous army. But "Roman France," as Neustria was already coming to be called, was defeated at Testry (near Peronne) by Teutonic France. This battle really ended the first dynasty of Frankish kings. For if the Merovingian monarchs still bore the royal title until 752, it was without enjoying even the semblance of power. In the space of these sixty-five years there was not a single movement in favour of this degenerate race, which seemed to have difficulty even in living. Almost all its members died young : those who attained the age of thirty were old men ; it was a matter of surprise that they reached that great age.

FOURTH PERIOD—CAROLINGIAN FRANCE

(687–887)

CHAPTER XI

RECONSTRUCTION OF THE EMPIRE AND OF THE CENTRAL POWER BY THE AUSTRASIAN MAYORS OF THE PALACE (687–752)

Origin of the Carolingians. — The Merovingian monarchy, which attained its zenith under Dagobert, fell after his death into the incapable hands of the *rois fainéants*, and was gradually dissolved. But among the Ripuarian Franks, who on the banks of the Rhine had preserved the warlike energy of the first conquerors, a family arose which possessed all the qualities necessary to enable it to exercise a great influence. Its property was considerable, since it held some one hundred and twenty-three domains, and it thus controlled a large clientèle, that is to say, many warriors were attached to its fortunes. If all the members of the family attracted attention by their wealth and courage, some were also distinguished for their saintliness. Three of them, Arnulf, Rudolf, and Drogo, successively held the episcopal see of Metz. Pippin of Landen was mayor of Austrasia under Clotaire II. "In all his judgments," says his biographer, "Pippin attempted to conform his decisions to the principles of divine justice, and in all matters availed himself of the advice of the blessed Arnulf, Bishop of Metz, whom he knew to be filled with the fear and love of God. If it happened that Pippin, owing to his illiteracy, was not in a position to decide a case, Arnulf, a faithful exponent of the divine will, supplied him with a just opinion on the matter, since he was able to interpret the Holy Scriptures, and before becoming a bishop had fulfilled without reproach the functions of mayor of the palace. Strong in the support of such a man, Pippin imposed the curb of equity upon the king himself, and prevented any abuse of royal power. After the death of Arnulf, he made use of the help of the blessed Cunibert, Bishop of Cologne, and his passion for justice may be gauged from the fact that he submitted his conduct to the supervision of such watchful and incorruptible arbiters. He passed his life in the earnest practice of just and honest dealing,

and by the counsel of these pious men he remained constant in the exercise of good works." Itta, the wife of Pippin of Landen, and his daughter, Gertrude, "the chosen bride of the king of angels," as an old chronicler calls her, died in the odour of sanctity, and Pippin himself was canonised, as Arnulf had already been. His grandson was St. Wandrille.

It is not surprising that a family so holy and so powerful secured an ascendancy over all the nobles of Austrasia. Its head possessed the mayoralty of that kingdom as if by hereditary right during the seventh century; Pippin of Landen and Arnulf were succeeded by Grimoald, who believed himself to be powerful enough to place his own son on the throne. Pippin d'Heristal, the grandson of Arnulf by his father Anseghis, and of the elder Pippin by his mother Begga, succeeded Grimoald.

Under the guidance of this family, which took its name from Charlemagne, the most illustrious of its sons, the nation after a century and a half of civil wars began to resume its former career of conquest. The dominion of the Franks had crumbled away in every direction; they restored it. Royal authority had become merely nominal; they revived its strength. In a few years they built up a new empire as wide as had been the old Roman Empire in the West.

The period of two hundred years, over which the history of this family extends, falls naturally into three divisions. In the first period, the efforts of the earlier Carolingians were directed to bring again under Frankish rule those peoples who had established their independence, and to bring those nobles who imagined that no duty of obedience was laid upon them under the power of the crown (687–768). The second period is that of the conquests of Charlemagne and of his attempts to organise his dominions (768–814). The third period is that of his successors, under whom the disruption of the empire by the revolt of its subjects occurred, the renewed overthrow of royal authority by the usurpations of the great vassals, and finally the entire defeat of the work undertaken by the Carolingians (814–887).

Pippin d'Heristal (687–714).—After his victory over the Neustrians at Testry, Pippin, says a chronicler, took King Thierry III. and his treasures, and returned into Austrasia. These words sum up effectively the revolution which had occurred. Kingship was not formally destroyed, but the Duke of the Franks only retained a monarch that he might display to the popular assembly at rare intervals a prince of the family of Clovis. These princes have been called the *rois fainéants;* they

deserve that their names should remain in an obscurity as great as that into which they themselves fell even during their lifetime.

Pippin's work was twofold. He had to reconstruct the Frankish empire which was dissolving into its constituent elements, and to restore the power of the crown which had been already ruined. Of these tasks, the second was the more difficult of accomplishment. The Austrasian aristocracy was ready enough to bring back under its yoke the peoples of southern Gaul and the Germanic tribes which had delivered themselves from Frankish domination, but they designed that this should result in their own advance and not in their decline. Yet, when they assisted their leader to destroy the liberty of others, they supplied him also with the temptation and the power to attack their own immunities. This was hardly the case under Pippin, but was seen clearly under Charlemagne.

While conciliating the nobles in every way, Pippin also revived the ancient institution of the *Champs de Mars*, by which means he gave himself an ally against the nobles in the body of free men, and he consulted this assembly every year on questions of peace and war.

The Neustrians did not attempt to recover from their defeat and Pippin endeavoured to attach them to his cause by marrying his son Drogo to the widow of their last mayor, Berthaire. Aquitaine was organised under national chiefs, but did not constitute a menace as the Germanic tribes became. It was against the latter that Pippin turned. "He made many wars," say the chronicles, "against Radbod, the pagan Duke of the Frisians, and against other princes, against the Suevi, and against many other nations; in these wars he was ever victorious."

Valuable allies aided him in this struggle; the missionaries who sought to evangelise the people Pippin tried to placate by bringing them within the limits of a great empire. St. Willibrod, appointed Bishop of the Frisians by the pope in 696, converted Radbod.

Death of Pippin d'Heristal (714) : Insurrection.—Pippin died in 714; his elder son, Drogo, had predeceased him, and his second son, Grimoald, had been assassinated at Liége as he was praying in a church. Grimoald had a son, a minor, Theobald, and him Pippin appointed as mayor of Neustria and Austrasia under the guardianship of his grandmother, Plectruda. But those who had been with difficulty held in check by the strong

arm of Pippin, refused to obey a woman and a child. The Neustrians established a mayor of their own, Raginfred, and attacked Austrasia from the west, while the Frisians and Saxons fell upon it from the east. The Austrasians thus hard pressed abandoned Plectruda and the child who had been given them as their chief. They took from the prison into which Plectruda had thrown him Charles, the natural son of Pippin, better known by the nickname of Marteau or Martel, which his bravery and energy in battle gained for him.

Charles Martel (715–743).—Charles was twenty-five years old, a true barbarian, a rough soldier. "A herculean warrior," says an old chronicle, "he was a victorious prince, who passing beyond the limits by which his ancestors had been restrained, and adding notable victories to the triumphs of his fathers, gained successes with honour over chieftains and kings, peoples and barbarous tribes, so that from the Slavs to the Frisians, to Spain and the Saracens, none of those who rose against him escaped from his hand, which subdued them under his empire and reduced them under his power." The situation of Charles was at first critical. The Neustrians and Frisians entered Austrasia simultaneously and penetrated as far as Cologne. He retired into the impenetrable district of the Ardennes, kept watch from the summit of those wooded hills, and waited for a favourable moment. One day with only five hundred horsemen he surprised the Neustrian army near Amblef; the enemy were seized by such a panic that they fled in all directions. Some of the fugitives threw themselves into the church of Amblef; one had reached the threshold in his flight when an Austrasian, giving a final thrust with his sword, struck his foot which was still outside the door. A question arose as to whether the right of sanctuary had been violated. The Neustrians said that it had; the Austrasian answered that he had respected all that part of the man's body which was within the holy place, and struck only that part which was outside it. It was decided that his contention was just.

A more serious battle took place in the following year at Vincy near Cambrai, where the Neustrians suffered a bloody defeat (717). The Aquitainians having come to their aid, Charles defeated the combined armies in a second battle near Soissons (719). He allowed the Neustrians to retain the puppet king, Chilperic II., whom Raginfred had given them, but ruled in his name. Repeated expeditions forced the Alemanni, Bavarians, and Thuringians to recognise the old supremacy of

the Franks ; the Frisians were threatened, and six times Charles invaded the land of the Saxons.

Victory of Poitiers : the Franks save Christendom from the Mohammedan Invasion (732).—But the greatest glory of Charles Martel was that he delivered France from that tide of Mohammedan conquest before which Africa and Spain had fallen. Masters of the Iberian Peninsula (711) after a battle which raged for three days, the Arabs were not checked by the lofty barrier of the Pyrenees ; they entered Gaul through the province of Septimania, captured Narbonne, Carcassonne, and Nîmes, besieged Toulouse, and almost destroyed Bordeaux. They advanced still further, reaching Poitou on the west and Burgundy on the east ; Autun was sacked, and in 731 they burned the church of St. Hilary at Poitiers.

The Merovingian Eudes, who reigned at Toulouse as Duke of Aquitaine, was defeated on the banks of the Garonne and resolved to apply for help to the mighty Duke of the Franks, and the champions of the two great invasions, the German and the Saracen, met in the neighbourhood of Poitiers. The conflict was terrible, and in popular memory survived as the most appalling of mediaeval battles. It effected the salvation of Christendom. Three hundred thousand Saracens, according to the exaggerated estimate of the old chroniclers, fell by the sword. The survivors fled for safety to the walls of Narbonne, and of all their conquests in Frankish territory the invaders preserved only Septimania, the coast line from the Rhône to the Pyrenees. After this victory, the Duke of Aquitaine, a descendant of Caribert, took an oath of fealty to the mighty mayor of Austrasia.

Conquest of Burgundy and Provence (733–759).—The Burgundians had refused submission to the degenerate successors of Dagobert, and Charles next turned his arms against them. Lyons, Vienne, Valence, and Avignon received Frankish garrisons, and being thus master of the Rhône valley, he advanced three or four years later to attack beyond the river those whom he had conquered at Poitiers. He invaded Septimania, destroyed the fortifications of Nîmes, burned its arenas, on which traces of the fire which he kindled may still be seen, and destroyed the maritime towns of Maguelone and Agde. In 739 he completed the reduction of Provence by taking the two powerful cities of Arles and Marseilles. The conquest of Septimania was reserved for his son Pippin.

Papal Invitation to intervene in Italy.—To reward his vic-

torious soldiers, Charles distributed to them lands or benefices which he appropriated from the vast domains of the Church. The clergy hated him and cursed his memory, though just before his death the pope appealed to him to invade Italy and protect him against the Lombards.

Mayoralty of Pippin the Short (741–752).—Of the two sons of Charles Martel, one, Carloman, received Austrasia and the land beyond the Rhine, while the other, Pippin, received Neustria and Burgundy. After the death of Thierry IV. in 737 Charles Martel had left the throne vacant, and Carloman followed this example, since in the midst of his German vassals he had no need to hide his power under the name of a king. Pippin the Short, master of the western districts, wishing to win over the Neustrians by flattering their old attachment to the royal house of Meroveus, proclaimed Chilperic III.

Victories over the Bavarians, Alemanni, and Aquitainians.—The dukes of the Bavarians, Aquitainians, and Alemanni refused obedience to the new rulers of the Franks, but the two brothers acted in concert and triumphed. Odilon, Duke of the Bavarians, submitted: the Duke of the Alemanni was deposed, and Hunold, Duke of Aquitaine, retired into a monastery. Carloman followed his example, and shut himself up in the monastery of Monte Casino (747). He had two sons, but Pippin appropriated his brother's inheritance without troubling as to the rights of his nephews, and, master of the whole empire, determined to put an end to the anomalous state of affairs which had subsisted since the Battle of Testry. His house had now attained such glory that he did not fear to resume the attempt which had been so disastrous in the case of Grimoald a century before.

The Last Merovingians (752).—"The family of the Merovingians," says Einhard, "had long ceased to display any virtues, nor was there anything illustrious about its members except their possession of the title of king. The prince was content to have flowing locks and a long beard, to sit on a throne and to represent the monarchy. He gave audience to ambassadors, and made to them the answers which were suggested or rather dictated to him. With the exception of a pension for his support, hardly assured and regulated by the mayor of the palace according to his pleasure, the prince held only one manor bringing in a modest revenue and there he held his court consisting of a few domestics. If there was need for him to travel anywhere, he went as the peasants did, seated in a waggon drawn by oxen and driven by a cowherd. It was thus that the king came to the

general assembly of the nation, which met every year to transact the business of the realm."

Relations of the Carolingians with Rome : Conversions of the Frisians and Saxons.—It was not difficult to hide in the depth of some monastery a monarch who had thus become useless and whose very existence was almost forgotten. Pippin already had national approval of his design, but he wished also to secure the appearance of right. The Iconoclastic Controversy had produced a rupture between the papacy and the Byzantine empire ; the pope, threatened in Rome by the Lombards, needed some external support to save his independence, and he could find such support only among the Franks. For a long time the papacy had been connected with the rulers of that people, for since the time of Gregory the Great the Roman Church had resumed with energy the task of converting the heathen. England had been conquered by its missionaries, Germany was next attacked. St. Columbanus and St. Gall brought Helvetia within the fold ; others spread the gospel in the valley of the Danube ; Willibrod carried it to Frisia, Winfried into Saxony. All these missionaries set out upon their perilous journey from the land of the Franks. There they prepared for the attack upon idolatry ; there they found pious recruits to aid in the sacred fight; and there, in the event of a reverse, they sought a refuge. On their side, the kings and dukes saw clearly enough that the spiritual conquest of the Germanic lands would prepare the way for their political conquest. They accordingly encouraged and supported the missionaries ; their chief, the Anglo-Saxon Winfried, became celebrated under the name of St. Boniface, and was one of the advisers of Carloman. The two princes, at the councils of Leptines (473) and of Soissons (475), showed a pious and enlightened zeal for the true interests of the Church, and for the reformation of morals and discipline.

Pippin was thus naturally led to seek from the pope who implored his aid the grant of the title of king to him who held the royal power. "In the year 751," says Einhard, "Burchard, Bishop of Wurtzburg, and Fuldrad, a chaplain priest, were sent to Rome to Pope Zachary to consult the pontiff as to the kings who were then in France, and who, while possessing the royal title, had no shadow of royal power. The pope answered that it was far better that he who held the power should hold the title also, and enjoined that Pippin should be made king."

Childeric III. sent into a Monastery (752).—"In this year (752), after receiving the sanction of the Roman pontiff, Pippin

was declared King of the Franks, was anointed for his high office with the mystic unction by the holy hand of Boniface, bishop and martyr of blessed memory, and raised on the shield according to the custom of the Franks in the town of Soissons. As for Childeric, who was falsely styled king, Pippin shut him up in a monastery," that of Sithieu or St. Bertin, near St. Omer, where he died three years later.

The end of the first dynasty of the Frankish kings excites no regret as it created no impression. Contemporaries only saw in the event the just punishment of the contempt which the Merovingians had too often displayed for the Church. " The man of God," says the biographer of St. Columbanus, " sought out Theudebert, King of Burgundy, reproached him with his pride, and urged him to enter the bosom of the Church to repent, lest after having lost his earthly kingdom he should lose eternal life also." The kings of the first dynasty preserved even in the midst of their degradation something of that fierce barbarism of mind which is never found in the princes of the second dynasty. When he had heard the words of the monk, Theudebert and all his companions began to laugh, saying that they had never yet heard of a Merovingian becoming a monk of his own accord. " He despises the honour of becoming a clerk ; he shall become one whether he will or no," cried the saint, and Pippin was employed to bring this prophecy to pass.

CHAPTER XII

THE WARS OF PIPPIN THE SHORT AND CHARLEMAGNE (752–814)

Expedition of Pippin the Short into Germany (755).—When St. Boniface revived for the benefit of the son of Charles Martel the Jewish ceremony of anointing with mystic oil, it was the intention of Pippin, by securing this obsolete consecration from the Church, to give to his recent kingship a species of religious inviolability. He was, however, uncertain that the revolution which he had effected did not appear as a usurpation to certain scrupulous advocates of Merovingian legitimacy, and he therefore hastened to justify his action by his services. His authority extended over a small part of that district which may be most conveniently described under its modern name of Germany. Against the Saxons he made only two expeditions ; they

promised a tribute of three hundred horses, and free access to their land for Christian missionaries. In this quarter, Pippin seems to have desired not to disturb by warlike operations the civilising work of the priests, and his whole attention and all his efforts were directed rather towards the south, towards Italy, Aquitaine, and southern Gaul.

Expeditions of Pippin into Italy (755–756): The Donation of Pippin.—In 755, Pope Stephen II. came in person to France to beg the help of Pippin against the Lombards, and conferred upon the king and his successors the title of Patrician of the Romans, which carried with it a certain vague sovereignty over the eternal city. Pippin was consecrated a second time by the pontiff, he then forced the passage of the Alps, which the profoundly degenerate masters of Italy proved incapable of defending, and besieged the Lombard king in Pavia. Aistulf promised to restore the lands which he had taken from the Roman Church, but failed to do so. In the following year, Pippin again entered Italy, compelled the Lombards to resign Ravenna and the whole exarchate, which rightfully belonged to the Byzantines. As he had no desire to retain such distant possessions, nor to restore them to the schismatic Greeks, he granted them to St. Peter; this "Donation" was the origin of the temporal power of the popes (756).

Conquest of Septimania (752–759).—The Italian war, of which the results were far-reaching, had presented neither dangers nor difficulties; the war of Aquitaine presented both. The descendants of the Merovingian Caribert reigned at Toulouse, having been adopted by the Aquitainians as their native princes, and as a result a national and bitter war broke out between them and the Franks. It began on the side of Septimania (Bas Languedoc), where the Goths rose against the Arabs and called the Franks to their help. Nîmes, Agde, and Béziers opened their gates, but Narbonne resisted for seven years. On its capitulation in 759, the Frankish empire was for the first time extended to the eastern Pyrenees.

Conquest of Aquitaine (759–768).—The dominions of Pippin now encircled Aquitaine on the north and east, and Duke Waifer was summoned to give up certain fugitive Austrasian *leudes*, and to restore the goods which he had taken from the churches. On this occasion also Pippin appeared as the champion of the Church. On Waifer's refusal, Pippin at once crossed the Loire, and from that moment Aquitaine was every year the scene of extensive Frankish raids, being handed over to systematic

devastation. From the Loire to the Garonne houses were burned, trees cut down. Each year the ravages were extended; first Bordeaux and its district suffered, then Auvergne and Limousin, then Quercy. Waifer with a handful of brave men constantly retired before the invader; his towns fell one after the other; all his men were taken or slain; he still fought on. At last, for some unknown reason, he was murdered (768). The independence of Aquitaine died with him, but among the Gallo-Roman people the sentiment of liberty was so active, hatred for the Franks so deep-seated, that more than once in later years the district struggled to recover its independence.

Death of Pippin (768).—On his return from this expedition, in 768, Pippin died at Paris, "and," says Einhard, "his sons, Charles and Carloman, were raised to the throne by the assent of the Franks." Pippin was surnamed "the Short" on account of his slight stature, which did not at all impair his strength, if any credence may be given to a very dubious story which relates that at a single blow he cut off the head of a lion, of which every one else was in terror. In his reign, the general assemblies were held in May instead of in March; they met regularly every year, and bishops were summoned to them as well as nobles. In 757, Constantine Copronymus, Emperor of Constantinople, had sent to him the first organs ever seen in France, and they were placed in the church of St. Cornelius at Compiègne.

Charlemagne and Carloman (768–771).—The empire only remained divided for three years, which were occupied with the completion of the work of Pippin in Aquitaine. On hearing of his son's death, Hunold left his monastery and again took up arms. Defeated, he was given up by the Gascons, but made his escape and carried to the Lombard court his spirit and his hatred for the Franks. In order to hold the turbulent population of Aquitaine in check, Pippin had already built the castle of Turenne; Charlemagne constructed that of Fronsac on the Dordogne, and in Bordeaux, the capital of the district, he set up at the gate of Ste. Croix, as a sign of his triumph and as a perpetual threat to that great city, a statue to his father.

Carloman had rendered inadequate help to his brother in this war, and the misunderstanding which thus arose was threatening civil strife when the younger prince died. He left sons, but the Austrasians, having to choose between them and a man who had already shown himself to be the worthy successor of Pippin, did not hesitate to select the latter, nor had the uncle any

scruples in despoiling his nephews. The rules of succession were not then defined as they are now, but this incident shows that the ancient right of the Germanic peoples to elect their own chief was regarded as superior to that of sons to inherit from their father.

Charlemagne, Sole King (771).—Charles won the title of "the Great" (magnus) by his victories, and this epithet has been inseparably united with his name by posterity. His long reign of forty-four years falls into two divisions, in the first of which he conquered, in the second of which he organised. By his victories, he extended the frontiers of the new Frankish empire to the Elbe, the Theiss, and the Bosna on the east; to the Garigliano in Italy and the Ebro in Spain on the south, thus doubling the area of the kingdom which he had inherited from Pippin. He was no crowned sage, no pacific prince assuming arms only in self-defence; he was an uncultured barbarian. No attack threatened him; the Arabs were divided, the Avars weakened, the Saxons unable to carry on a serious war beyond the limits of their forests and marshes. If Charlemagne led his armies beyond the original boundaries of his kingdom, it was because, in common with so many other rulers, he aspired to dominate more peoples and to leave a name which should re-echo through the centuries.

Conquest of Half Italy (773–774).—The sons of Carloman had taken refuge with Didier, King of the Lombards, who had already afforded an asylum to Hunold, the implacable enemy of the Franks. Charlemagne had recently insulted the king by sending back to him his daughter, after having been married to her for a year. Didier, moved by his resentment and by the councils of Hunold, urged the people to anoint the sons of Carloman as kings. Adrian informed Charlemagne who decided on an expedition across the Alps. The passes were no better defended than they had been in the time of Pippin, and only the towns of Pavia and Verona offered any opposition. Charles, leaving an army before these two places, went to Rome to receive the title of "Patrician," an oath of fealty from the Romans, and to confirm to the pope the Donation of Pippin. At Pavia, Hunold was stoned to death by the people, whom he endeavoured to induce to continue the defence; Didier and his children were confined in a monastery, and Charles took the title of King of the Lombards (774). This event began the misfortunes of Italy, the independence of which was from this time almost entirely extinguished, since the successors of Charlemagne, as Holy Roman

emperors, claimed to rule in the valley of the Po. The Lombards retained their possessions in the south of the peninsula, the Frankish frontier being fixed at the Garigliano, and if the dukes of Beneventum accepted the overlordship of Charles, the tribute due from them was in general only paid when an army came to demand it.

War of Saxony (772–804).—The war of Saxony was far more difficult and dangerous than that of Italy, since the Saxons, a brave and spirited people, heroically defended their liberty. It is unfortunate that for this struggle we have only the bald and prejudiced narrative of Einhard. Conquered nations very rarely relate their misfortunes, and as a result posterity, deceived by the accounts given by the conquerors, too often cries with the Gallic *brenn*, *Vae victis !*

Religion supplied the pretext for the war. The Saxons burned the church of Deventer and threatened with death the missionaries who were labouring in their midst. Charles at once entered their land, wasted it everywhere with fire and sword, took the castle of Ehresburg, and overthrew the idol, Herminsul, the memorial raised by patriotism to Arminius, the liberator of the Germans from Rome. In 774, while Charles was in Italy, the Saxons tried to burn the church of Fritzlar; the king returned and began a war of extermination, the chief events in which were the victories of Bucholz, Detmold, and Osnabruck; the massacre of 4500 Saxons, who were beheaded at Verden; the forcible removal of part of the race to other provinces; and the compulsory conversion of the inhabitants. The hero of the resistance was Widikind, who fought until 785, when he submitted and was baptised at Attigny.

The Saxons take up Arms for the Last Time in 803.—As early as the year 787, Charles had issued, for the regulation of Saxony, a capitulary for the infraction of almost every provision of which the death penalty was assigned. Capital punishment was inflicted not only for such crimes as were usually involved in it, but also for mere breaches of ecclesiastical ordinances, such as failure to observe the Lenten fast, refusal of baptism, association with pagans, and adoption of the heathen custom of cremating the body of a dead man.

Charlemagne was able to carry on this system for forty years, and as a result his methods, despite their atrocity, were successful. Saxony after his reign was subdued but Christian; divided into eight bishoprics, filled with new cities and abbeys which formed centres of civilisation, this district, which had hitherto

been barbarous and pagan, entered into communion with the rest of the empire.

War between the Elbe and the Oder (789).—Conquerors are doomed to an eternal extension of their conquests. Beyond the Saxons, beside the Elbe, Charlemagne found the Wiltzes, and to prevent their incursions into Saxony he made them tributaries (789). When this had been accomplished, he found himself involved in wars against their northern neighbours, and the Franks, having passed the Weser, crossed the Elbe, which formed the frontier of Saxony, and penetrated to the Oder, while they were also obliged to extend their dominion to the banks of the Eider in order to prevent the Danes from entering Germany. The district between the Elbe and the Oder, however, did not receive that organisation which was given to the rest of the empire.

This territory bordered upon Bohemia, in which the Elbe rises, and which is enclosed by a ring of mountains. The armies of Charles entered it, but failed to reduce its people to submission.

War against the Avars (787–796).—There was in Bavaria an ancient ducal house the members of which regarded themselves as the equals of the Carolingians, and the chief of which, Tassilo, son-in-law of Didier, formerly King of the Lombards, submitted with reluctance to Frankish rule. In 787 a vast plot was formed. Tassilo, with the help of the Avars who occupied Pannonia to the east of Bavaria, was to attack Austrasia, while the Byzantines, in alliance with the Duke of Beneventum, were to fall upon Italy. Informed by Pope Adrian of the danger, Charles forestalled it by able and energetic measures. Tassilo was surrounded by three armies and soon appeared before Charles as a suppliant. The assembly of the Franks condemned him to death ; he was confined in a monastery with his son, and his duchy, subdivided into counties, was administered by Frankish counts. The conspirators in Italy had no time to act. The Avars arrived too late. They attacked Friuli and Bavaria simultaneously (788), and being driven back into Pannonia were pursued by the Franks. The war lasted until 796, when the "ring," or camp, of the Avars was taken. The Franks found there so much treasure, the product of the pillage of the Byzantine empire, that they became, according to Einhard, as rich by comparison as before they had been poor. The struggle was entirely fatal to the Avars, for that people, which had hitherto been feared throughout the Danube valley, was so weakened that it was reduced, in order to avoid the attacks of the Slavs, to seek an asylum from Charlemagne in Bavaria. Part of their land formed

the East Mark and was organised in the same manner as Saxony, towns and bishoprics being founded in it. It became the later Austria.

War of Spain (778–812).—Charlemagne was at Paderborn, engaged in effecting the compulsory baptism of the Saxons, when a Saracen, who declined to recognise the Caliph of Cordova, arrived with offers to place the Franks in possession of the towns which he had held south of the Pyrenees. Charles accepted the invitation, and passed with a numerous army through Gascony, of which the duke, Lupus, was forced to take an oath of fealty to him. He took Pampeluna and Saragossa ; but his allies gave him little help, and he returned to France through the passes of the Pyrenees. As the army was defiling in a long and narrow line through the valley of Roncesvalles, the Gascons, in ambush in the woods, fell upon the rear guard, threw it into disorder, and killed many counts. It was here that Roland fell. He was the commandant of the Marches of Brittany, and history knows nothing of the popular legends associated with his name. He was, however, famous in the poems of the Middle Ages, which celebrated at length his heroic exploits and his enchanted horn, of which it was said :—

> " Bruient li mont, et li vauls resona;
> Bien quinze lieues li oïes en ala,"

and *Durandal,* his sword, which could cut through rock and granite. William the Conqueror, setting out for the conquest of England, caused the " chanson de Roland " to be sung at the head of his army, and the Basque peasant still shows amid the Pyrenees the *Breche de Roland,* a circle of stones.

The Franks made six other expeditions beyond the Pyrenees. They were led by Charles's son and resulted in the formation of the Spanish March, or county of Barcelona, and of the March of Gascony, which later became the kingdom of Navarre. On this side, however, the empire was only extended to the Ebro ; Huesca and Saragossa remained in the hands of the Arabs.

In order to free the coasts from the piratical attacks of the Saracens, a fleet was sent to Corsica, Sardinia, and the Balearic Isles, from which the infidels were expelled (779).

Charlemagne, Roman Emperor in the West (800).—By the year 800 all these wars were more or less finished. Charles found himself at that date master of the modern France, of a very large part of the modern Germany, of three-quarters of Italy, and of a part of Spain ; he had increased by more than one-third the

territory which his father had left him. His vast possessions no longer formed a kingdom ; they had become an empire. He felt that he had done enough to justify him in ascending the throne of the western emperors, and as his father had demanded a royal crown from the pope, so he demanded an imperial coronation from the pope.

In the middle of the year 800, Charles went to Italy to direct an expedition which his son Pippin was leading against the Lombards of Beneventum. " He reached Rome," says Einhard, " on November 24. The pope was accused of many things : the king began the examination of the charges. But as no one was able to undertake their proof, the pope mounted his throne in the presence of all the people in the basilica of St. Peter the Apostle, took the Gospels in his hand, called upon the name of the Holy Trinity, and by oath purged himself of the crimes with which he was charged. On the same day, the priest Zachary, whom Charles had sent to Jerusalem, arrived at Rome with two priests, who came to the king by order of the patriarch, bearing his blessing with the keys of the Holy Sepulchre and of Calvary and a standard. The king received them graciously, kept them some days with him, rewarded them with presents, and gave them an audience when they were about to depart. On the holy day of the Saviour's birth, while the king prayed before the altar of the blessed Apostle Peter, the pope placed the crown on his head, and the whole population of Rome cried aloud, ' To Charles Augustus, crowned of God, the great and pacific Emperor of the Romans, life and victory.' After *Laudes*, he was adored by the pontiff according to the custom of ancient princes, and giving up the title of patrician, he was called Emperor and Augustus."

This ceremony, which occurred in the church of St. Peter on Christmas Day, 800, was an important event. The title of emperor in the west was drawn by the pope from the ruins under which it had been buried by the barbarians, and exhibited to divided and hostile nations as a standard to which they might rally. A new right was given to those who might inherit this crown, the right of commanding the peoples of Italy, Germany, and France, who from that time found themselves united under the rule of the first Germanic emperor. When the accidents of succession and fortune had transferred this title to the German kings, France found herself powerful enough to reject the rule of a foreign Caesar, but Italy did not, and from this circumstance arose half the evils from which the peninsula was to suffer.

Another personage acquired on this day an important prerogative. By crowning Charlemagne, Pope Leo III. fulfilled a function similar to that fulfilled by St. Remigius when he consecrated Clovis. His successors converted this duty into a right and regarded themselves as the dispensers of crowns. During the whole Middle Ages, imperial coronation could be received only at Rome, and from the hands of the pope, and many wars resulted on account of this new right.

Results of the Wars of Charlemagne.—Of the conquests of Charlemagne some were durable, some ephemeral, some beneficial, some the reverse. All his efforts beyond the Pyrenees proved abortive. The county of Barcelona, which he had added to France, did not remain united to it, and the March of Gascony naturally looked south across the mountains. It would have been more profitable if he had reduced the Bretons in the sense of incorporating them fully in Frankish national life, instead of contenting himself with a formal submission. The conquest of the Lombard kingdom was of no profit either to the Franks or to Italy, though it benefited the pope, whose political position it improved and to whom it eventually assured independence. The land which benefited most from these long wars was that which suffered most from them, Germany. Before Charlemagne, Germany was still "Germania," a weltering chaos of pagan or Christian tribes, all alike barbarous, hostile to each other, without any bond of unity between them. There were Franks and Saxons, Thuringians and Bavarians. After Charlemagne there was a German people, and presently there was also a German kingdom. To have created a people is a glorious act; it is a glory which few conquerors have won, since they have excelled rather at destruction than at construction, but it is one which Charles the Great secured to the full.

Appearance of the Northmen.—Charlemagne, by advancing the limits of his empire to the Eider, believed that he had protected Germany from the Northmen, but that people, perhaps under the influence of refugees from Saxony, appeared in their ships and began to raid the long coast-line of the empire. If the monk of St. Gall may be believed, they penetrated to the Mediterranean even in the emperor's lifetime. "They entered," says the chronicler, "the harbour of a town where Charlemagne was and were driven away, but the emperor, rising from the table, stood for a long while at a window looking eastwards, his face bathed in tears. As no one dared question him, he said to the nobles round him, 'Do you know, my friends, why I weep so

much? Truly I do not fear that I shall suffer from these wretched pirates, but it grieves me that while I yet live they have succeeded in reaching this shore, and I am tormented with bitter sorrow when I think of all the evil that I foresee will come through them upon my heirs and their people.'" The story is dramatic, but it is unfounded. It is, however, certain that during the reign of Charlemagne the Northmen appeared, since he is known to have taken measures of defence against them; two squadrons were stationed, one at Boulogne and another near Ghent, while two more were based upon the Garonne and the Rhône.

CHAPTER XIII

GOVERNMENT OF CHARLEMAGNE

Extent of the Empire.—The frontiers of Charlemagne's empire were on the north and east the Atlantic, from the mouth of the Elbe to the Spanish coast of the Bay of Biscay, with the exception of the Armorican peninsula, which was only tributary: on the south, the Pyrenees and the lower course of the Ebro in Spain: the Garigliano and Pescaro in Italy, with the exception of Gaëta and Venice, which owed a nominal allegiance to the Byzantine empire: and in Illyria, the Cettina or Narenta, with the exception of the maritime towns of Trau, Zara, and Spalatro, which were held by the Greeks. In the east, the frontier was formed by the Bosna and Save in Illyria, in Germany by the Theiss, from which the frontier bent westwards across Moravia as far as the mountains of Bohemia which it left to the east. Then it went northwards to the Saal and the Elbe. The district situated north of the mouth of the Elbe, as far as the Eider, recognised the direct rule of Charlemagne.

Beyond these boundaries there were peoples half subdued, half independent. The people of Navarre in the Pyrenees, the Duke of Beneventum in Italy, payed tribute when it was demanded at the point of the sword. Brittany and Bohemia had been ravaged but not conquered. Between the Elbe and the Oder, the Obotrites were allies rather than subjects, and it was found necessary to preserve their friendship by affording them a burdensome protection. As for the Wiltzes, so often defeated, they never laid down their arms. To these continental districts there may be added the Balearic Isles, Corsica, and perhaps also

Sardinia, doubtful possessions, which were disputed between the Franks, the Byzantines, and the Saracens.

Administration : The Count and the Centenier.—The empire was divided into counties and their areas reproduced with practical exactness the former limits of the Roman municipal divisions. The counts, who were the constant and resident representatives of the central government, combined civil, military, and judicial functions. On their appointment to their office, the king said, "Having proved your loyalty and services, we give you the authority of a count in this district. Preserve the faith which you have sworn, and take care that all the people who inhabit this district are treated with moderation. Rule them justly according to their laws and customs. Defend the widows and orphans. Repress with severity thieves and malefactors, that the people, living in prosperity under your rule, may rest in joy and peace. Take care that all the receipts due from our demesnes are annually paid into our treasury."

At a later date the viscount appears as a subordinate to the count. Under the earlier Carolingians, there existed the *centenier*, also styled the *viguier* or *vicar*, who had jurisdiction over a district which was originally that inhabited by a hundred families. The vicar held courts three times a year; he was assisted by the *scabini*, royal judges, appointed by the count, and by the free men of his district. He tried all cases other than those involving a death penalty, forfeiture, or loss of personal liberty; these were heard only at the tribunal of the count.

The Missi Dominici.—The *missi dominici*, usually a count and a bishop, were royal officials who went out four times a year to supervise the counts placed under their direction. It was their function to keep the emperor informed of the condition of public affairs. They heard the complaints of his subjects, reformed abuses, and received appeals from the judgments of the counts. "If a count does not do justice to those under his jurisdiction, then our *missi* shall reside in his house and live at his expense until right has been done," says a law of Charlemagne (779).

General Assemblies.—"It was the custom of this period," says Hincmar, Archbishop of Reims, "to hold two assemblies every year, in the spring and in the autumn. At both there were submitted to the great men the provisions of such laws, or *capitula* as they were called, which the king had drawn up under the inspiration of God, or for which the necessity had been made known to him in the interval between the two assemblies.

When the assemblies had received the royal suggestions, they debated them for one, two, three days, or more, according to the importance of the matter. Representatives of the king received their questions and made known the answers to them. No stranger might approach the place of assembly until the result of the discussions had been told to the sovereign, who then, in virtue of the wisdom with which he was endowed by God, adopted a decision which was accepted by all. These decisions were then embodied in one, two, or more capitularies, so that, with God's help, provision was made for all the needs of the time.

"While matters were being treated in this way outside the royal presence, the king himself, in the midst of the crowd which came to the general assembly, was occupied with the receipt of presents, with greeting the more important persons there, whether ecclesiastical or lay, talking with such as he rarely saw, displaying an affectionate interest in the older men, and jesting with the younger. If those who were deliberating upon public affairs expressed the desire, the king appeared among them. They then explained to him with perfect freedom their opinion on every matter, and all things were amicably discussed between them."

"If the weather were fine, all business was transacted in the open air; if not, in many different buildings. Those whose duty it was to debate upon the suggestions of the king were separated from the multitude of those who had come to the assembly, and the less important persons were not allowed to mingle with them."

"The places appointed for these assemblies of great men were divided into two parts, so that the bishops, abbots, and clergy were able to meet without coming into contact with the laity. In the same way the counts and other greater men of the state were separated at morning from the remainder of the multitude. The lords thus set apart met in the hall appointed for them, the clergy in one place, the laity in another, seats being honourably prepared for them. They might sit together or separately, according to the nature of the business which they had to transact, as to whether it was ecclesiastical, secular, or concerned both church and state. It was provided that they might, if they would, summon any one either to give his aid or to answer questions, and dismiss him after having received the required help."

"The king further inquired from each as to the state of that

part of the realm which was under his control. For all were strictly commanded to discover during the interval between two assemblies everything that occurred within and without the kingdom, and it was their duty to inquire into the affairs of aliens as well as into those of subjects, into those of enemies as well as into those of friends. The king wished to know whether in any part of the realm the people murmured or were disturbed, and if so what was the cause of the disturbance, whether there was any disorder with which the assembly should deal, and other similar details. He also strove to discover whether any of the tribes under his rule wished to revolt, whether any of those in rebellion seemed inclined to submit, whether such as were still independent threatened any attack upon the kingdom."

These assemblies, then, did not resemble the ancient military gatherings of the Franks, where every free man took part in the discussions. As the time of the assembly was also that of the annual review of the army, and as it preceded the opening of any campaign or occurred at the end of a campaign, the free men were still present, but they permitted the great men to deliberate apart. The dukes, bishops, counts, and abbots were alone summoned by Charlemagne to aid him with their advice. But in memory of former privileges, laws still asserted the sanction of the nation: *De his omnes consenserunt* (To this all have agreed).

Capitularies.—Sixty-five capitularies of Charlemagne are extant; they contain 1151 articles. The diversity of the topics with which they deal indicates the activity of the king and his eager desire to establish good order in his dominions. He turned his attention to every matter. At the same time as he was presiding over ecclesiastical councils and discussing with his bishops the problem of image worship or the heresy of Felix of Urgel, he regulated the most minute details in the administration of his farms, ordering that care should be taken that none of his serfs died of hunger, "that with God's help they may be saved therefrom." He opposed one of the most general tendencies of his age, the appropriation of royal demesnes by private individuals, and by his advice and counsels he warned the people against impostors and charlatans. He attempted to extinguish mendicity by compelling his nobles to support the beggars found on their estates, and if he imposed in every parish the duty of contributing to the church a tithe or tenth part of the produce of the soil, he yet divided this into three parts, the first being devoted to the maintenance and adornment of churches,

the second to the support of the poor and of travellers, and the third alone to the personal use of the priests. One of his great works was the introduction of the Gregorian chants into churches; another was the reformation of the monasteries which was undertaken by St. Benedict Anian, for since the transference of ecclesiastical property by Charles Martel to his *leudes* many secular clerks appeared who carried lances and swords, and devoted themselves only to hunting and war.

He increased the jurisdiction of the Church with the result of freeing it from royal control. He attempted to enforce upon merchants the use of just weights and measures, and established a maximum, a price above which they might not sell their goods.

He regulated military service, every free man possessing four acres being obliged to serve. Those who only held four acres were divided into two classes: the first served, the second was obliged to supply arms, horses, and necessary provisions.

He strove to repress theft by the severity of the penalties decreed against it; for the first offence a man lost an eye, for the second his nose, and for the third suffered death.

Taxes.—Since the beginning of the seventh century, public taxes had ceased to exist. The king only received that which came to him as a landowner from his numerous tenants, the produce and revenues of his private demesnes, the personal service and dues from counts and holders of royal benefices, voluntary gifts, and the tribute of conquered territory. Landowners were obliged to supply means of transport and subsistence for the king and his representatives when they passed through their estates, and were further charged with the upkeep of roads and bridges. The army supplied its own equipment and lived at its own expense and without pay: the land or benefice which the soldier had received supported him.

Public Works and Schools.—In order to effect the civilisation of Saxony and Pannonia, Charlemagne had founded bishoprics, each of which became the nucleus of an important town. He began a work which has only been completed in modern times, a canal between the Rhine and the Danube. He built a bridge at Mainz, a church at Aix-la-Chapelle, palaces at Nimwegen and Ingelheim, but he was driven to supply their decoration by pillaging Italy and despoiling Ravenna of its choicest marbles.

He restored a number of churches, demanding learning as well as piety from the priests; he created schools in the bishoprics and monasteries and in his own palace. He attended the lessons given, awarded prizes to those who showed most ability, and

shamed the sons of the nobles by advancing the sons of poor men above them. "You count on the services of your fathers," he said to them angrily; "know that they have been rewarded and that the state owes nothing to those who have not deserved recompense by personal service." To the bishops and monks he declared, "It is pleasing to God that a man should live uprightly, but it is also pleasing that he should speak wisely." Alcuin one day heard him cry, "Ah! if only I had around me twelve clerks as skilled in all knowledge as were Jerome and Augustine."

First Literary Renaissance.—Charlemagne applied himself closely to study, of which, in the eyes of his father and grandfather, a warrior had no need. "Not restricting himself to the knowledge of his mother tongue, he was anxious to learn foreign languages, and he was so well acquainted with Latin that it served him in place of his own language. As for Greek, he understood it better than he talked it. The wealth of his conversation was such that he seemed to be too fond of talking. Devoted to the liberal arts, he respected men who had distinguished themselves in that field and loaded them with honours. Peter the Deacon, an old man born at Pisa, taught him grammar; in other branches of knowledge his master was Alcuin, a Breton deacon of Saxon birth, the wisest man of his period. Under his direction Charles devoted much time and labour to the study of rhetoric, dialectic, and astronomy, acquiring ability to calculate the motions of the stars and following their course with scrupulous attention and amazing sagacity. He even tried to write, and was accustomed always to keep under his pillows tablets and copies in order that he might practise forming letters whenever he found a moment of leisure. But he met with little success in this study, which he began too late and at an unsuitable age. All the nations subject to him had not at that time a written law; he ordained that their customs should be reduced to writing. He made the same order with regard to the barbarous poems in which the deeds of the chiefs of old time were celebrated, and in this way preserved them for posterity. He also caused a grammar of his native language to be begun. In one of his capitularies he takes credit to himself for having corrected the "books of the old and new covenant, which had been corrupted by the ignorance of old copyists."

A Frankish Poem.—Unfortunately no trace of these poems which Einhard mentions has been preserved for posterity, with the doubtful exception of a fragment found inside the cover

of a manuscript in the abbey of Fulda. An example of the grand epic style, it is written in the Frankish idiom and in the characters of the eighth or early ninth century. It is clearly part of one of those long poems, of which the Nibelungen, the German Iliad, was the latest example. This relic of the ancient poetry of the Franks runs as follows :—

"I have heard that it arose from a meeting of Hildebrand and Hadebrand, of the father and the son. So the heroes put on their garb of war, they covered themselves with the array of battle, and moreover they drew on their gauntlets. As they urged their war-horses to the fray, Hildebrand, the son of Herebrand, spoke—for he was a noble man and his mind was prudent —and he asked shortly, 'Who is your father among the race of all mankind, and of what family are you? If you can answer me, I will give you a garment of battle, triple-edged. For, O Warrior, I know all the race of men.'

"Then Hadebrand, the son of Hildebrand, answered, 'Some men of my land, men old and wise, but who now are dead, have told me that my father was called Hildebrand; I call myself Hadebrand. Once he went towards the east; he fled from the hatred of Odoacer; he was with Theodoric and with many of his heroes. He left alone, in his own land, his young wife, his tiny son, his arms which had no more a master; to the land of the east he went. For when the sorrows of my cousin Theodoric began, when he was left friendless, my father would not dwell longer with Odoacer. Valiant warriors knew my father; that bold hero fought always in the forefront of the army; too much did he love to fight, and I know not if he be still in life.

"'Lord of all mankind,' said Hildebrand, 'never wilt thou look down from Heaven and permit a battle between men of the same blood.' Then he took off a precious bracelet of gold, which the King of the Huns had given him, and which encircled his arm. 'Take this,' he said to his son, 'I give it to you as a present.' Hadebrand, son of Hildebrand, answered, 'It is lance in hand, point to point, that a man should win such presents. Old Hun, you are a bad comrade; subtle spy, you would deceive me by your words, and I desire to strike you with my lance. How is it that you who are so old can find such deceits? Sailors who ply their art on the sea of the Wends have told me of a fight wherein was killed Hildebrand, the son of Herebrand.' Hildebrand, son of Herebrand, replied, 'I see well from your armour that you have not served any famous chief and that in this realm you have done no valiant deed. Alas, alas! Almighty

God! what a destiny is mine. I have been a wanderer from my native land for sixty winters and sixty summers. I have been set always in the forefront of the battle; in no case have chains ever been placed on my feet, and now my own son must needs strike me with his glove and with his axe will slay me, or I shall be his murderer. If your arm serves you well, you may easily win from some redoubtable man his weapons, as you rob his corpse. Do so, if you believe that right is on your side, and that it is the most infamous man in all the east who would turn you from this combat for which your soul so yearns. Good comrades who watch us, in your courage judge which of us to-day can better wield his weapons, which of us is skilled to render himself master of two suits of armour.' Then they hurled their javelins, sharp-pointed, and these their shields held; then did they fall one upon another. Their stone battle axes crashed. They dealt heavy blows at their white bucklers; their armour was dented, but their bodies stood firm."

Alcuin and Einhard.—In the seventh, and in the early years of the eighth century, France was more backward than the other countries of Europe. Charlemagne was forced to search beyond his dominions for men who could meet his desires. All the masters of the palace school were foreigners; at their head was the Anglo-Saxon, Alcuin, whom Charlemagne had great difficulty in keeping with him. Later there came the Irishman, Clement; Peter of Pisa; the Lombard Paul the Deacon, who has left a history of his nation; Theodulf, a native of Spain or of Septimania and the best poet of the age, who was nicknamed Pindar in the palace school. It must, however, be confessed that Alcuin's poor verses won him the epithet of Horace, and Angilbert secured that of Homer. But they were all eclipsed by a Frank, Einhard, whom a pleasing legend has made the son-in-law of Charlemagne. He was the emperor's secretary, and after his death was concerned with the greatest affairs of the empire. His *Vita Caroli Magni* is not only an invaluable store-house of authentic facts, but is also a history, a true piece of literature. It is known that Charlemagne himself appeared in this Frankish "Academy," in which he received the epithet of David. The discussions which they carried on revealed the puerility of their knowledge, but none the less great importance attaches to the efforts of these men to escape from barbarism. Charlemagne trying to write and meeting with little success, Charlemagne becoming absent-minded as he listens to the pedantic *disputatio* of Alcuin and Pippin which is still extant,

will always be what he was in truth, the apostle of a literary renaissance, which was assuredly slow to develop, but which none the less was never wholly interrupted. From the time of Charlemagne, the world was never again cloaked in those thick clouds of darkness which had enveloped it in the seventh and eighth centuries.

Relations of Charlemagne with Haroun al-Raschid and with the Byzantine Empire.—The heirs of the *rois fainéants* were thus able to render a good account of their usurpation. The Frankish empire which had fallen had been revived and extended, and its lost authority recovered and increased. It was no empty title that Charles assumed at Rome ; he was in very truth the Emperor of the West. Einhard shows him to us in his palace at Aix-la-Chapelle, ever surrounded by kings or ambassadors, who had come from the most distant lands. Egbert, afterwards King of the West Saxons, Eadulf of Northumbria, came to his court. The kings of the Asturias and of Scotland invariably styled themselves his subjects when they wrote to him, and the former rendered him an account of all his wars, and offered him a share in the booty. The brilliant and redoubtable master of western Asia, the caliph Haroun al-Raschid, sought his friendship and sent him presents, among which was an elephant, an animal which the Franks had never seen before, and a chiming clock ; and the emperors of Constantinople treated with him, pursuing, according to Einhard, the Greek proverb which still exists, "Have a Frank for a friend, but not for a neighbour." On the testimony of one Byzantine historian, Charles considered marriage with the Empress Irene and the consequent union of the two empires.

The monk of St. Gall, who wrote in 884, shows in one of his stories the idea of Charlemagne's power which existed, if not among his contemporaries, at least in the following generation. Charlemagne had crossed the Alps to attack the King of the Lombards. Didier was on the walls of Pavia with Count Ogger, who had fled in order to escape punishment for some fault, and he watched with terror the approach of the Frankish army. "First of all, he saw only a thick cloud of dust ; it was caused by the engines of war by which the walls of the capital were to be battered. 'Here is Charles,' cried Didier, 'with this great army.' 'No,' answered Ogger. Then there appeared a huge crowd of common soldiers. 'Surely Charles advances triumphant in the midst of this host.' 'Not yet,' replied Ogger. Next there appeared the body of guards, veteran warriors who never knew

rest. 'Now Charles is coming,' said Didier, full of terror. 'No,' answered Ogger, 'not yet.' After these came the bishops, abbots, clerks of the royal chapel, and counts. Then Didier cried, choking with fear, 'Let us go down and hide ourselves in the bowels of the earth, far from the face of this terrible foe.' 'When you see the harvest fields shaking with terror,' said Ogger, 'then you may believe that Charles is approaching.' As he said this, a dark cloud appeared, driven by the east wind, which converted the day into night. But the emperor advanced a little nearer, and the gleam of his arms lightened over Pavia a day darker than the darkest night. Then Charles himself appeared, clothed from head to foot in steel armour, a lance on his left hand, his right resting upon his invincible sword. Ogger recognised him, and struck with terror, trembled and fell, crying, 'It is he.'"

Death of Charlemagne.—It was on January 28, 814, that this great man died. His reign constituted a great and glorious effort to weld together the barbarian world and what remained of Roman civilisation, to set a term upon the chaos resultant from the invasions, and to found an organised system in which papal and imperial authority strictly united should maintain order in Church and state alike. It was a very difficult problem which was given to Charlemagne to solve, but all its difficulty appeared only after his death. The work of Charlemagne did not actually endure; the causes of its failure will soon appear. The name of this mighty genius, rough as he was, is yet encircled with imperishable glory, and remains in the mind of mankind with those of two or three great men who, if they have not accomplished more good, have yet made more stir in the world. In the case of Charles, the amount of good accomplished by him far surpasses that which was only empty fame and sterile ambition. He created modern Germany, and if the bond between nations which he wished to form was broken, his great figure towers above the Middle Ages as that of the genius of order, ever urging mankind to emerge from chaos, to find union and peace under a glorious and mighty chieftain. It is impossible to estimate how much the memory of this great emperor aided kings in restoring their power and in establishing centralised states.

CHAPTER XIV

DISMEMBERMENT OF CHARLEMAGNE'S EMPIRE OWING TO THE RISING OF THE NATIONS (814–843)

Louis the Pious (814-840).—Charlemagne had been able to found a vast empire; but it was beyond his power to promote among these peoples, differing in origin, language, and customs, identity of interests and feelings or a common desire to remain united in one large political family. It possessed material unity, but moral unity was lacking, and that alone is true and lasting.

"The brilliancy with which Charles outshone all other monarchs," said the monk of St. Gall, "had induced Gauls, Aquitainians, Burgundians, Alemanni, and Bavarians to glory in being confounded under the common name of Frank." When Charlemagne was dead, all that had lent an appearance of honour to their servitude was destroyed: each thought only of himself and dragged at his bonds. The private ambitions of princes of the imperial family assisted the dismemberment of nations, those of great landowners and of imperial ministers favoured the subdivision of fiefs.

Charlemagne recognised the necessity of giving satisfaction to those peoples among whom the spirit of nationality was strongest, and had crowned his three sons: Louis as King of the Aquitainians, Pippin of the Italians, and Charles of the Germans. The two last died before their father, which cancelled that partition; but Charlemagne later granted Italy to Bernhard, son of Pippin. He intended these kings to be docile lieutenants; so they remained while he lived, but when the strong hand which held together this medley of nations lay cold in death, they parted from each other. Peoples desired kings, kings desired independence. To curb these ambitious projects a strong will was needed, and he who received the unwieldy heritage of the powerful master of the west was the feeblest of men.

Louis was then thirty-six years of age. He was pious and upright, but his piety was that of a monk, not of a king, and his justice readily degenerated into weakness or cruelty. He began by deeds of reparation which seemed to the old advisers of Charlemagne an imprudent surrender of the rights of the empire. He gave back to men who had been despoiled of

them their liberty and estates; he once more allowed to the Frisians and Saxons the right of inheritance of which they had been deprived, and permitted the Romans in 816 to appoint a new pope, without waiting for imperial confirmation. Then, when Stephen IV. consecrated him in France, he allowed him to pronounce words which revealed the wish of the holy see to appropriate the right of disposing of the imperial crown: "Peter glories in making this gift to you, for you assure him of the enjoyment of his free rights."

At the same time, Louis effected strict reforms at court, where during the declining years of Charlemagne licentiousness had set in; he severely punished the guilty, and in the hope of reducing the power of the aristocracy and calling back to political life the lower-class free men who were increasingly dominated by the great landowners, he ordered that all free men should take an immediate oath of fealty to him. In this way he angered many without doing much good; then to soothe their discontent he lavished benefices on them, giving them perpetual possession, a system which was only too readily followed by his successors, and which reduced them to beggary. For there being now no public taxes such as there had been two centuries ago, the prince's sole revenue consisted in that which came to him from his demesnes, and in alienating his estates, he alienated also his revenue.

Partition among the Sons of the Emperor (817).—At the Assembly or Council of Aix-la-Chapelle in 817, a law was made to establish uniformity in the monastic order which was placed entirely under the rule of St. Benedict. The emperor also made a partition of his lands: Aquitaine was granted to Pippin, Bavaria to Louis, while his eldest son Lothaire was associated with him in the empire. Without his authorisation his brothers could neither enter into war, nor conclude a treaty, nor cede a town.

Revolt and Death of Bernhard (817).—Bernhard, who had been made King of Italy by his grandfather, and who, as the heir of Charlemagne's eldest son, aspired to a more exalted position, alleged that he was injured by this partition. The peoples and cities beyond the mountains, who already dreamed of freeing themselves from the barbarians in order to enter upon a free and national existence, shared in his resentment. "The emperor was returning from a great hunt in the forest of the Vosges to spend the winter at Aix-la-Chapelle when he heard that his nephew Bernhard, foolishly following the advice of perverse

men, had revolted; that already all the princes and cities of Italy had sworn fealty to him; in short, that all roads by which that kingdom might be entered were closed and fortified against him. This sad news being confirmed by faithful witnesses, the emperor collected troops from Gaul, from Germany, from all sides, and arrived at Châlons with a very large army. Bernhard, recognising his inability to stand against such forces, placed himself in the hands of the emperor, laid down his arms, and fell at his feet, confessing his error. His example was followed by the lords of his kingdom; a crowd of clergy and laity had shared in his crime, and chief among those who were implicated were the bishops of Milan, Cremona, and Orleans. When the heads of the conspiracy had been arrested, the emperor spared the lives of Bernhard and his accomplices, which should have been forfeit according to the law of the Franks, but he had their eyes torn out. Bernhard died a few days after this punishment. The bishops were deprived and imprisoned in monasteries; as for the rest of the rebels, they were either banished or tonsured. Among the latter were three young brothers of the emperor (Astronome)."

Repression of Insurrections.—The attempt made by Italy was premature. The Frankish nation held too firmly to this empire which it had founded to allow it so soon to fall in ruins, and it threw itself with enthusiasm into all wars which might secure its preservation. The death of Charlemagne had been the signal for a general uprising among all tributary and hostile peoples. The Slavs had entered Saxony; the Avars of Pannonia had risen in revolt; the Bretons had emerged from their peninsula; the Gascons destroyed a Frankish army and the Arabs of Spain invaded Septimania; while the Saracens ravaged the south coasts and the Northmen those of the north and west. All these attacks were repulsed; the rebels were once more reduced under the Frankish yoke, and Louis seemed for a time to wield the imperial sceptre in as worthy a manner as did his father.

Public Penitence of Louis (822).—Soon, however, the distressing weakness of the prince became patent to all. "In the year 822 he called a general assembly at a place named Attigny. Having summoned to this assembly the bishops, abbots, ecclesiastics, and great men of his kingdom, his first care was to reconcile himself with his brothers whom he had forced to be tonsured, and afterwards with all those whom he had injured. Then he made a public confession of his faults, and submitted of his own

accord to do penance for all his sins, both against his nephew Bernhard and against others."

Thus was seen the impressive spectacle of a powerful man publicly owning his faults and redeeming them by penance, a spectacle which Theodosius had once offered to the Roman world. But after having humiliated himself in the cathedral of Milan, Theodosius had appeared as stronger both in his own estimation and in that of his subjects, since it was before God alone and under the weight of a remorseful conscience that he had bowed his head. Louis went out of the palace of Attigny his reputation diminished, his office degraded, because it was from a political body, from a rival authority, that he had received absolution. From that time all knew how far they could go with such a man.

Deposition and Restoration of Louis (830–834).—In 823, there was born to the emperor by his second wife Judith a son whom he named Charles. The mother wished this child also to have a kingdom, and the father, cancelling in 829 the partition of 817, gave him Alemannia. No sooner had he done this than his elder sons stirred up the people, a vast conspiracy was formed, and the emperor, abandoned by all, fell into the hands of the rebels. They forced the empress to take the veil, tonsured her brothers, and imprisoned their father with the monks, hoping that the latter would persuade him of his own accord to embrace the monastic life. Lothaire, the head of the insurrection, hoped thus to free himself from his father without violence. But the monks were well aware that they would gain more by placing their penitent on the throne than by keeping him with them in the cloister. They embarked on another conspiracy, sent secret messages to Louis and Pippin in which the emperor promised to increase their kingdoms if they should restore him to his throne. Already chafing under the superiority of Lothaire, they consented, and the assembly of Nimwegen which, called together in the midst of the eastern Franks, desired the preservation of the empire, gave back to Louis his authority (830).

Second Deposition of Louis (833).—Louis did not profit by this lesson. Once again seated on his throne, he was no wiser in his government of the empire. Intrigues were renewed. He deposed Pippin and gave his kingdom of Aquitaine to the son of Judith; his other sons interpreted this proceeding as a threat against themselves. They once more united, and with three armies attacked their father near Colmar in Alsace. Pope Gregory IV. accompanied them. Louis had considerable forces,

and a battle seemed inevitable. At the last moment, however, his army was seduced. The pope threatened to excommunicate all who fought against Lothaire, and the emperor himself sent away those who remained faithful to him, saying, "I do not wish any one to die for me, go over to my sons"; and he, with Judith and Charles, placed himself in their hands. Nevertheless, this treachery left a deep impression on the minds of the men of that period, who named the spot the "Field of Lies," Lügenfeld.

The victors insulted the age and dignity of their father by subjecting him to public degradation. They forced him to read before all the people in the church of St. Médard of Soissons a long recital of his faults, accusing himself of having handed over his people to traitors and the state to murder and pillage, of having made new divisions in the empire and having caused civil war. Then the bishops solemnly removed his military belt and clothed him in the robe of a penitent.

Second Restoration of Louis (834).—This humiliation of the empire in the person of the emperor revived the party of Louis. His patient resignation and the revolting harshness of his sons excited popular compassion. Moreover, the brothers were on no better terms with each other than they had been on the occasion of Louis's first deposition. If Louis and Pippin did not wish to be despoiled in order to profit Charles, they certainly objected to obeying Lothaire, who aimed at maintaining imperial authority undivided; and in the fact that their subjects were reluctant to remain within the empire, they found sure support and a devoted army. Thus they freed Louis from the monastery in which he was confined by Lothaire, and restored him to power (834). But he declined to resume the insignia of his office until he had secured the consent of the bishops.

New Blunders: New Wars: Death of Louis (840).—The emperor having left the cloister, for which he was so well fitted, fell again into his former errors. In his blind predilection for his youngest child, he forgot that the root of all his misfortunes was the partition which he had made during his lifetime between his sons. In 837 he gave Burgundy, Provence, and Septimania to Charles. Pippin, King of Aquitaine, dying in the following year, his children were deprived, and Charles received that kingdom also. Then Louis the German and Lothaire, whose dominions had been reduced, that of the former to Bavaria, the latter to Italy, took up arms. The emperor, to avoid fighting both, negotiated with Lothaire (839). He gave up

to him all the provinces in the district of the Jura and the valley of the Rhône east of the Meuse, with the title of emperor; the western provinces were to be the share of Judith's son, Louis the German retaining only Bavaria. The latter, supported by all Germany, protested against this unjust partition; and the old emperor spent his last days in this impious war. He died on the Rhine, near Mainz: "I forgive him," he said to the bishops who pleaded for the rebel, "but let him know that he caused my death." The Middle Ages, more affected by his virtues as a man than by his faults as a king, have been full of leniency to the memory of Louis the Pious.

Battle of Fontanet (841) and Treaty of Verdun (843).—Since the death of Charlemagne, the empire which he had founded had been the scene of constant disturbance, calling to mind some giant writhing in the agony of death. Each prince aimed at securing a kingdom and every important section of the empire desired a king of its own in order to form an independent state. In 817 the first partition took place; there were others in 829, 837, and 839. At last, the peoples of the empire, weary of this perpetual rending, met to decide the question once and for all at the momentous Battle of Fontanet, near Auxerre. All the tribes of Germany under Louis the German, and the Neustrians, Aquitainians, Burgundians, and Provençals under Charles the Bald, fought side by side to overthrow the political order established by Charles Martel, Pippin, and Charlemagne, for the benefit of the Austrasian Franks. The latter, that is to say, nearly the whole of the Frankish population established between the Seine and the Rhine, who only defended their own cause in upholding that of the empire, were seconded by the Italians, who had adopted the new emperors as the legitimate heirs of Marcus Aurelius and of Trajan. They were commanded by Lothaire, eldest son of Louis the Pious (841). He bore the title of emperor and wished his brothers to be mere lieutenants.

Both armies prepared for this battle with a kind of religious contemplation, showing that the peoples would regard the issue of this last struggle as a judgment of God. "All hope of peace being removed," says Nithard, an historian of that time, himself a grandson of Charlemagne, "Louis and Charles sent word to Lothaire that on the following day, at the second hour of the day, they would come to the judgment of Almighty God. Lothaire, as was his custom, treated the envoys with insolence, answering that they would see that he knew how to look to himself. At daybreak, Louis and Charles broke

up their camp and occupied, with a third of their army, the summit of an eminence bordering on the camp of Lothaire, and awaited his advance. Then ensued a great and fierce conflict on the banks of a small river, in which Lothaire was routed and fled with all his men. After the battle, Louis and Charles took council together as to the treatment of the fugitives. The two kings, having compassion on their brother and his people, proposed to display to them at this time the mercy of God. The rest of the army having agreed to this, they all broke off the action and returned to their camp about midday. On the morrow, which was Sunday, after the celebration of mass, they buried friends and enemies alike, and tended all the wounded with equal kindness to the best of their ability. Then the kings and the army, grieved that they should have come to blows with a brother and with Christians, asked the bishops what they should do.

"All the bishops met in council, and it was declared in that assembly that the fight had been entered upon in the cause of justice, which the judgment of God had clearly proved, and that accordingly, whoever had taken part in the fray, either by advice or action, should, as the instrument of the Will of God, be exempt from all shadow of blame."

These details have been given in order to point out the influence which the bishops had acquired, and the novel character of these wars in which the old Frankish ferocity played no part. But increased humanity involved a decline in courage. These warriors, in the midst of whom councils were held, later allowed small bands of Northmen to ravage their country with impunity, like a pack of famished wolves, before which all fled in terror.

The Oath of Strasburg (841). — Thanks to the Christian sentiments of the victors, or to the resistance of the vanquished, which was greater than the historian would have us believe, the battle of Fontanet was far from being decisive, and the war continued. Louis and Charles met at Strasburg to cement their union against Lothaire, and, before their soldiers, swore to an alliance, one in Teuton or German, the other in the Roman tongue or French. The oath of Strasburg is the first example on record of the French language formed by the mixture, in unequal proportions, of the three idioms, Celtic, Latin, and German, which were spoken in Gaul, Latin easily predominating over the other two. This alliance was celebrated by military festivities, in which some have found the origin of tournaments,

though in actual fact they resembled far more nearly the gorgeous fantasias which occur to-day among the Arabs of Algeria.

Treaty of Verdun : The Empire is divided into Three Kingdoms (843).—It was quite evident that Louis and Charles were firmly resolved to break up the empire. Lothaire therefore decided to treat with them. One hundred and ten commissioners travelled through all the provinces and drew up a table in order that a just partition might be made. It was accomplished at Verdun (843). The three principal races of the empire, the Germans, Gallo-Franks, and Italians, separated for ever, the first under Louis, the second under Charles, and the third under Lothaire. The name of emperor, a title without power, remained attached to the possession of Rome and Italy. But in order to render the share of Lothaire less unequal, they ceded to him a long, narrow strip of territory which stretched from the Meuse to the Rhine, from the Saône and the Rhône to the Alps (Belgium, Lotharingia or Lorraine, county of Burgundy, Dauphiné, and Provence). This treaty reduced Gaul by one-third and cut it off for the first time from its natural boundary of the Rhine and the Alps. The efforts of Francis I., Henry II., Richelieu, Louis XIV., and the revolution did not altogether succeed in recovering the lost frontier. Charles the Bald, who signed that agreement, was, in truth, the first king of modern France, as Louis the German was the first king of Germany. As for Lothaire, he continued the existence of the kingdom of Italy, which was destined so often to die and to be born again.

Thus was accomplished the rending of the empire. Some men of exalted mind mourned for the unity of Christian Europe, which had been destroyed by the Treaty of Verdun. A touching testimony has come down to us in the following verses of the Church of Lyons:—

"A noble empire flourished under a brilliant diadem ; there was but one prince and one people ; all the towns had judges and laws. The zeal of the priests was maintained by frequent councils ; young men pored unceasingly over the holy books, and the inclination of children was bent to the study of letters. Goodwill was preserved by love on one side, fear on the other ; and the Frankish nation shone in the eyes of all the world. Foreign kingdoms, the Greeks, barbarians, and the senate of Latium sent ambassadors to her. The race of Romulus, Rome herself, the mother of kingdoms, submitted to this nation. It was there that her chief, upheld by the strength of Christ, received the apostolic gift of the diadem. Happy man had he

known his good fortune, the empire which had Rome for her citadel and he who bears the keys of Heaven for her founder ! Now torn asunder, this great power has lost at once her glory and the name of empire ; the kingdom, but lately so united, is now divided into three, and there is no one who can be regarded as emperor ; in place of king, one sees a kinglet, in place of kingdom, the fragment of a kingdom. The common weal is no more considered ; each is absorbed in his own interest. Man is careful for many things, he does but forget God. The shepherds of the Lord, skilled at arranging meetings with one another, cannot hold their synods in the midst of such division. There is no longer an assembly of the people, there are no laws ; an embassy would come there in vain, for there is no court. Now that the alliance is broken, what will become of the peoples bordering on the Danube, the Rhine, the Rhône, the Loire, and the Po, all formerly united by bands of concord ? They will be tormented by miserable strife. For what purpose has the anger of God caused her to suffer all these evils ? There is hardly a soul who thinks of this with horror, who ponders on these events and is cast down. In the midst of the tearing asunder of the empire they rejoice, and call an order of things peace in which none of the blessings of peace are enjoyed."

CHAPTER XV

DISMEMBERMENT OF THE KINGDOM OF FRANCE BY THE USURPATIONS OF THE LEUDES (843–887)

Charles the Bald (840–877).—Up to this point the history of the Gauls, the Gallo-Romans, and the Franks has been followed ; from the date of the Treaty of Verdun the history of the French begins. France, at this time, had received all the races which were destined to make up her population except that of the Northmen (who, however, had already appeared on the coasts and had there established themselves, though only in small numbers), and all the elements, Celtic, Roman, Christian, and Germanic, from which combination her civilisation originated. This mingling of races was already so advanced that it was hardly possible to distinguish the Gallo-Roman from the Frank, the civilised from the barbarian. They were all alike in manners and customs and their language was almost identical. The French tongue appeared officially at the Treaty of Verdun ; the

right to it ceased to be personal and became local; Frankish customs replaced Roman or barbarian codes; there were no slaves and few free men; soon the nation was to be composed almost wholly of serfs and lords.

But this France no longer extended over the whole of Gaul, the Treaty of Verdun having thrown back her boundaries to the farther side of the Scheldt and the Meuse, behind the Saône and Rhône, and the population established within these narrow limits found them yet too extensive; they wished to live apart, every man for himself, and no longer to submit to a vast dominion which ground them down and which they did not understand. Charlemagne's empire was split up into three kingdoms, France was shortly to be divided into feudal principalities, some of which were actually to aspire to the rôle of independent states. The chiefs of the Basques and Bretons were to claim the title of kings.

Charles the Bald, son of Judith and Louis the Pious, King of France since 840, was nothing but an ambitious nonentity. He—like Charlemagne—had much time at his disposal, for he reigned thirty-seven years; he was unable to make use of it. It is true that his embarrassments were many. During the very year when men were struggling for and against the empire at Fontanet, Asnar, Count of Jacca, assumed the sovereignty of Navarre and the Northmen burned Rouen; in 843 they pillaged Nantes, Saintes, and Bordeaux. At the same time the Aquitainians attempted to secure a national king; the Bretons found theirs in Noménoë whom Charles caused to be excommunicated by his bishops, but who defeated his lieutenants; Septimania found a chief in Bernhard; the Saracens and Greek pirates ravaged the south, while the Northmen devastated the north and west; finally, to complete the miseries of this unhappy century, the Hungarians, successors of the Huns and the Avars, arrived from the east.

The Northmen.—These redoubtable pirates were every year driven by hunger, thirst for pillage, and love of adventure from the barren regions of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. In three days an east wind drove their two-sailed vessels to the mouth of the Seine. Each fleet was under the command of a *konung*, or king. He, however, only ruled them by sea and in battle; at banquets the whole band sat at the same table and the horns filled with beer were passed from hand to hand, no man taking precedence over his fellows. The *sea king* was followed everywhere with fidelity and always obeyed with zeal, because he

was known to be the bravest of the brave, the one who never slept under a roof or emptied a tankard beside a sheltered hearth.

"He could guide his vessel as a good horseman manages his steed. To the ascendancy which courage and ability gained for him was added a certain superiority born of superstition; he was initiated into the science of the runes. He knew mysterious characters which graven upon swords ensured victory, and others which inscribed on the sterns of vessels and upon the oars prevented shipwreck. Their king was merely *primus inter pares;* their casual allegiance sat lightly upon them as also did the weight of their coats of mail, which they hoped soon to exchange for an equal weight in gold; the Danish pirates went gaily along the *road of the swans* as the old national poems express it. Sometimes they coasted the land and watched for their enemy in straits, bays, and small anchorages, which gave them the name of Vikings or children of the creeks; sometimes they rushed in pursuit of them across the ocean. The violent storms of the North Sea dispersed and broke up their frail crafts; they did not all rejoin the vessel of the chief at the rallying sign, but those who survived their shipwrecked companions continued to be full of confidence and free from anxiety, mocking the winds and waves which had failed to harm them. 'The force of the tempest helps the arms of our oarsmen,' they sang, 'the hurricane is at our service; it drives us where we would go.'" (Aug. Thierry.)

Often amidst the clash of arms and the sight of blood some of them would be seized with a mad fury which redoubled their strength and rendered them as insensible to wounds as if they beheld opening out before them a vision of the palace of their god, Odin, and the dazzling halls of Walhalla. Others, while suffering torture, affected an indomitable energy and sang, in the midst of carnage, their song of death. Thus the famous Lodbrog from the depths of a pit filled with vipers proudly flung these words at his enemies:—

"We have fought with the sword! I was yet young when in the East, in the straits of Eirar, we caused a river of blood to flow for the wolves, and invited the yellow-legged birds to a great feast of corpses. The sea was red as a newly opened wound, and the crows swam in blood."

"We have fought with the sword. I saw near Aienlane (England) innumerable corpses loading the decks of the ships; we continued the battle for six whole days without overcoming the

enemy; on the seventh, at sunrise, we celebrated the mass of spears, and Walthiof was forced to yield."

"We fought with the sword! Torrents of blood rained from our weapons at Partohyrth (Pesth); there was none left in the carcasses for the vultures; the bow twanged and the arrows buried themselves in the coats of mail, sweat trickled down the blades of the spears; they poured poison into the wounds and mowed down the warriors like the hammer of Odin."

"We have fought with the sword! Death clutches me, the bite of the vipers is deep; I feel their teeth far down in my breast. Soon, I hope, the sword will avenge me in the blood of Ælla. My sons will groan at the news of my death; their faces will flame with anger; such bold warriors will not rest until I am avenged."

"I must make an end, for here is the Dysir whom Odin sends to conduct me to his glorious palace. I go with the Ases to drink mede in the place of honour. The hours of my life glide away, and my smile braves death."

Religious mania was joined to this warlike madness; they loved to shed the blood of priests and to stable their horses in the churches. When they had ravaged a Christian country, they would say, "We have sung for them the mass of spears; it began in the early morning and lasted until night." Charlemagne had seen from afar these terrible invaders; under Louis the Pious they became bolder. In 836 some wintered in the island of Walcheron, and from there they put under contribution the riverside districts of the Meuse and the Wahal. From 843 they came annually. They entered by the mouths of the rivers, along the Scheldt, Somme, Seine, Loire, and Gironde, until they reached the interior of the country. A number of towns, even the most important, as, for instance, Orleans and Paris, were taken and pillaged, Charles proving to be incapable of defending them. All the land was ravaged from the Rhine to the Adour and from the ocean to the Cevennes and the Vosges. They even made it their custom not to return to their own country for the winter. They settled in the island of Oyssel, north of Rouen, at Noirmoutiers, at the mouth of the Loire, and in the river itself on the island of Bière, near Saint Florent. It was to that place that they carried their booty, and from there they started on fresh expeditions.

Edict of Mersen (847).—The chroniclers, not understanding this apathy in the Frankish people who were formerly so brave and who now allowed themselves to be pillaged by a few adven-

turers, can only explain it by supposing that there had been an appalling massacre at Fontanet.

> "Là perit de France la flor
> Et des baronz tuit lui meillor
> Ainsi trovèrent Paenz terre
> Vuide de gent, bonne à conquerre."

There is some truth in these words. Charlemagne's fifty-three expeditions had worn out the Frankish people and his conquests had scattered it over three kingdoms, since they were invariably accompanied by the settlement of some of his warriors. The dissensions of the sons of Louis the Pious supplied the finishing stroke. The free man now disappeared. This was the result partly of the heavy mortality in the frequent wars, partly of the fact that, amid the growing anarchy, almost all the free men had already abandoned a liberty which condemned them to live in perilous isolation, and had become the vassals of such as were able to protect them. The Edict of Mersen provided: "That every free man should be allowed to choose a lord, either the king or one of his vassals, and that no vassal of the king should be obliged to follow him to war except against a foreign enemy." Thus the subjects could bargain over obedience and the king in civil war was left unarmed, powerless. Since he was as unable to compel obedience from the great as he was to protect the weak, the latter grouped themselves round the former. The king's vassals diminished, those of the nobles increased. On all sides, national feeling was lost in wholly selfish interests. Rouen hardly troubled over the misfortunes of Bordeaux, nor Saintes over those of Paris; and thus it was that at this epoch, as during the last days of the Roman Empire, and for the same cause, the absence of a vigorous common sentiment, patriotism, made it possible for small bands to ravage a large country with impunity. Charles attempted to keep them away by giving them gold; it was the surest means of attracting them. The Roman Empire had acted in like manner to the barbarians, and it is well known with what success.

Associates of the Northmen.—The true Northmen could not be really numerous, for they came from afar and by sea. "But," says a chronicler of that period, "many of the inhabitants, forgetting that they had been made regenerate in the holy water of baptism, fell headlong into the dark errors of the pagans, ate with them the flesh of horses sacrificed to Odin and Thor, and with them took part in their crimes."

And these renegades were most to be feared. They acted as

guides to the invaders, knew how to baffle the ruses to which their fellow-citizens resorted to mock the greed of the barbarians, and had still less respect and pity than these for the creed and the people whom they had deserted. Sometimes, even, certain nobles were bribed by the Northmen not to interfere with their expeditions, receiving a tithe of the spoil of France.

Hastings, the Northman.—The most terrible of these pirates was Hastings, who, from 845 to 850, ravaged the country bordering on the Loire, sacked Bordeaux and Saintes, threatened Tarbes, in which town a victory over these barbarians is still commemorated, rounded Spain, and, still pillaging, reached the coasts of Italy. He had been attracted by the fame and riches of the capital of the Christian world; but he mistook Luna for Rome. Hastings sent word to the count and the bishop that his companions, conquerors of the Franks, wished no ill to the people of Italy, that they wished only to repair their damaged ships, and that he himself, weary of his roving life, desired to find rest in the bosom of the Church. The bishop and the count refused him nothing; Hastings was even baptised; but the gates of the town remained closed. Some time afterwards, the camp rang with lamentations. Hastings was dangerously ill; envoys were sent with this news and to declare at the same time that the dying man intended to leave all his booty to the Church on condition that his body was buried in consecrated ground. The anguished cries of the Northmen presently announced the death of their chief. They were allowed to bear his corpse into the town, and preparations were made for his burial in the church itself. But at the moment when the corpse was placed in the middle of the choir, Hastings suddenly sprang up and knocked down the bishop, while his companions, producing their hidden weapons, massacred priests and soldiers. Hastings, now master of Luna, discovered his mistake. He was informed that Rome was a long way off and that it would not be so easily taken. He again set sail with his booty and reappeared after some months at the mouth of the Loire.

Charles the Bald placed part of the country between the Seine and the Loire under the rule of Robert the Strong, ancestor of the Capetians, in order to oppose a more effective resistance to the Northmen and Bretons, a great number of the latter having fallen into the habit of joining the pirates. Robert twice vanquished the Bretons and defeated a body of Northmen who were again laden with booty from La Brie and the town of Meaux. Hastings met this valiant chief on his return

from Italy. He had just sacked Le Mans, when Robert and the Duke of Aquitaine overtook him at Brissarthe (Pont-sur-Sarthe), near Angers. The pagans were only four hundred strong, half Northmen, half Bretons; on Robert's approach they flung themselves into a church which they then barricaded. This happened in the evening. On the following morning the French renewed the attack. Robert had already laid aside his helmet and coat of mail when the Northmen suddenly flung open the doors and hurled themselves upon his scattered company. Robert rallied his men, forced the enemy back into the church, and attempted to follow them. But he was fighting bare-headed and with his breast unprotected; he was mortally wounded on the very threshold. Duke Rainulf fell beside him whom the chroniclers of that period describe as the "Maccabeus" of France (886). Hastings, delivered from this formidable adversary, ascended the whole length of the Loire and penetrated as far as Clermont-Ferrand. Only by the cession to him of the county of Chartres was it found possible to free France from his attacks. Later, at the age of seventy, he abandoned that possession in order to renew his career of adventure.

Beginning of Great Fiefs.—The Northmen created the greatest but not the only difficulty of Charles the Bald. Noménoë the Breton repulsed all his attacks, caused himself to be crowned king, leaving his title to his son, Hérispoë. The Aquitainians had chosen as their ruler the son of their late king, Pippin II., whom Charles the Bald had dispossessed. Expelled as a result of his vices, Pippin allied with the Northmen and Saracens to plunder his former subjects, but was taken and imprisoned in a cloister. Charles regained Aquitaine for a time, then lost it, then recovered it once more and gave it to one of his sons. But already the true masters of the country were Raymond, Count of Toulouse, who also reigned over Rouergue and Quercy; Walgrin, Count of Angoulême; Sanco Mitara, Duke of Gascony, whose capital was Bordeaux; Bernard, Marquis of Septimania; Rainulf, Duke of Aquitaine and Count of Poitiers; and Bernard Plantevelue, Count of Auvergne, all of whom rendered their positions hereditary. North of the Loire, Charles had even been obliged to constitute for Robert the Strong the great duchy of France from which sprang the third reigning house; north of the Somme, the county of Flanders in favour of his son-in-law, Baldwin Bras de Fer; and between the Loire and the Saône the powerful duchy of Burgundy for Richard the Justiciar. Thus, under the

grandson of Charlemagne, not only was the empire divided into kingdoms, but the kingdoms were already splitting up into fiefs.

Edict of Pistes (862).—But Charles made an effort to retain in his service and in that of the state the class of free men. In 862, the Edict of Pistes ordered a census to be taken of men bound to military service. The most severe penalties were declared against those who deprived them of their horses and weapons, and against the free men themselves who, to evade this duty, entered the Church.

Foreign Wars.—Although so weak at home, this prince none the less aimed at foreign conquest; this king who could not sustain his own crown attempted to win others.

On the death of the Emperor Lothaire in 855, his inheritance had been divided among his three sons. Italy fell to the eldest, Lotharingia to the second, and Provence to the third. The last only survived until 863, the King of Lotharingia only until 869, and neither left an heir. Charles the Bald attempted on their death to seize their dominions. His designs miscarried in 863, but in 870 he succeeded, and partitioned Lorraine with his brother Louis the German. In spite of his weakness and the disgrace of his reign, Charles the Bald restored to France at least in one direction some of the territory of which she had been deprived by the Treaty of Verdun.

Edict of Kiersy (877).—Instead of continuing this work, Charles now coveted the imperial crown which became vacant in 875. He went to receive it at Rome from the pope, assumed that of the kingdom of the Lombards at Milan on his way back, and his brother Louis the German having died, attempted to unite that state with his own—Germany to France.

At that very moment, the Northmen took Rouen from him, he was defeated on the Rhine, and Italy also slipped from his grasp. To persuade his vassals to support him in this quarrel, he assembled them at the diet of Kiersy-sur-Oise, and signed a capitulary which recognised hereditary right in all fiefs and offices. This act deprived royalty at once of powers which it had conferred and of estates which it had temporarily given up. It rendered public functions hereditary. Charles died during this Italian expedition at the foot of Mont Cenis.

Louis the Stammerer (877–879): Louis III. and Carloman (879–884).—Louis the Stammerer, son of Charles the Bald and King of Aquitaine since 867, succeeded him as King of France,

He was consecrated at Compiègne by Hincmar, Archbishop of Reims, the most eminent French ecclesiastic of that time. In order to conciliate the nobles, he ceded to them a part of the demesnes which yet remained to the crown, and similar grants were made on a lavish scale by his two sons, Louis III. and Carloman, who reigned conjointly after his premature death. Each day the situation became worse. In 879, Duke Boso caused himself to be proclaimed King of Provence, and they were unable to overthrow him. Charles the Bald had in 870 acquired half of Lorraine; they abandoned it and that country returned to Germany. Two victories over the Northmen, notably that of Saucourt near Vimeu, shed a certain halo over these princes. But those momentary advantages did not prevent the depredations from beginning afresh. In 882 the celebrated Hastings forced them to give up to him the county of Chartres, and Carloman gave money to the others to induce them to leave the country. "They promised peace," said the chronicler sadly, "for as many years as they were allowed a thousand pounds weight of silver." The two kings died within a short time of each other as a result of accidents; Louis in 882 and Carloman two years later.

Charles the Fat, King and Emperor (884–887).—They had a brother, Charles the Simple; the nobles preferred to him a grandson of Louis the Pious, Charles the Fat, at that time Emperor and King of Germany. The whole of Charlemagne's inheritance once more became united in his hands. But times had changed. This man who was laden with so many crowns was not even able to intimidate the Northmen.

Siege of Paris (885–886).—He had already ceded Frisia to one of their chiefs. Another, the famous Rollo, a kind of giant who always travelled on foot, there being no horse strong enough to bear him, took Rouen and Pontoise and killed the Duke of Le Mans. At the approach of his compatriots, Hastings, the former pirate, now Count of Chartres, hurried to join them and they all marched on Paris, which they had already pillaged three times. But Paris was already fortified. Massive towers guarded the bridges (Petit-Pont and Pont-au-Change) which joined the Ile de la Cité to the suburbs on the two river banks. The Seine was thus barred to the seven hundred great ships which the Northmen wished to take as far as Burgundy, a province they had not yet entered. The inhabitants, encouraged by Gozlin, their bishop, and by Eudes, their count, son of Robert the Strong, resisted

for eighteen months. The attack was begun on November 26, 885. The Northmen attacked the tower of Grand-Pont, on the right bank, which was in an unfinished condition ; and two days of bloody fighting ensued. Bishop Gozlin was wounded by a javelin. The Northmen, repelled, established themselves round the church of St. Germain l'Auxerrois in an entrenched camp. They had learnt from deserters all that was still known of Roman military science. They first constructed a movable tower of three stories ; but when they attempted to approach the walls, the Parisians killed those who pushed it with arrows. Then they advanced with battering-rams, some under light shields covered with untanned hides to protect them from the fire, others formed a tortoise with thin shields. Arrived at the edge of the trench, to fill it up they flung in earth, faggots, trees, and even the corpses of their prisoners whom they slaughtered before the eyes of the besieged. While the more distant Northmen dispersed the defenders of the battlements with a hail of arrows and bullets, those nearest the wall shook the tower with the battering-rams ; all these efforts failed. The Parisians poured over them great streams of boiling oil, wax, and liquid pitch ; their catapults hurled enormous stones which smashed through the mantlets and linked shields, or else they lifted those with iron hooks and uncovered the assailants, who were instantly riddled with darts. Three fire ships, hurled against the bridge, were stopped by the piers on which it rested and failed to set it on fire.

This unlooked-for resistance had lasted over two months, when a sudden rise of the river carried away a part of Petit-Pont in the night of February 6, 886. The Northmen at once rushed upon the tower on the left bank, which was now isolated from the town. Only twelve men remained in it. They defended it for a whole day, then retiring on the debris of the bridge, they continued the fight. At length they yielded on condition that their lives should be spared. But no sooner had the barbarians got these brave men in their power than they killed them. One of them, a man of noble mien, appeared to be a chieftain. They decided to spare him ; but he insisted on sharing to the end the lot of his companions. " You will never obtain a ransom for my head," he said to them, and he forced them to kill him.

But the great courage of the Parisians stirred the whole country, and some were emboldened to imitate it. Several bands

of pirates who had left the siege were beaten, and Duke Heinrich, the adviser of Emperor Charles, attempted to throw a relieving force into the town, but the pagans still maintained the blockade. Misery reached its height in the city, many people died. Bishop Gozlin and the Count of Anjou "passed to the Lord." Brave Count Eudes escaped to urge the arrival of the emperor; as soon as he saw his army on the march, he returned and shut himself in with his people. The promised help at last appeared, led by Duke Heinrich. Wishing himself to reconnoitre the ground, he advanced too far; his horse fell into one of the hidden pitfalls of the enemy, and he was killed. His followers disbanded; once more Paris was forsaken. The Northmen took it for granted that despondency now reigned and that they would easily overcome an exhausted people. They attempted a general assault, but were repulsed on all sides; they tried to set fire to the gate of the great tower, and built an enormous pile against it; but the Parisians made a sudden sally, drove back the assailants, and extinguished the fire.

After many weary months, Charles arrived at length with an army on the heights of Montmartre. The Parisians, full of enthusiasm, waited for the signal to fight, when they were told that the emperor had again purchased the retreat of an enemy whom they had almost conquered, and had given them permission to winter in Burgundy, in other words, to ravage that province. They refused to be implicated in any way in this shameful treaty, and when the ships of the Northmen came up to pass the bridges, they refused them passage. The pirates were obliged to drag their ships over the land and to make a long detour in order to avoid the heroic city (887).

That year Paris gloriously won her title of the capital of France, and her chief, the brave Count Eudes, became the founder of the first national dynasty.

Deposition of Charles the Fat (887).—The contrast between the courage of that little city and the cowardice of the emperor turned every one against that unworthy prince. He was deposed at the diet of Tribur (887), and from that day Germany, Italy, and France have never had a common ruler. The Carolingian empire was irrevocably torn asunder, and the scattered pieces served to form seven kingdoms; France, Navarre, Cisjurane Burgundy, Transjurane Burgundy, Lorraine, Italy, and Germany.

Establishment of the Feudal System.—It was not the empire

alone that was dismembered, but also the kingdom and kingship. The hereditary right of fiefs and benefices had covered France with a multitude of petty kings. Thus, in 887, the Duke of Gascony possessed almost all the country south of the Garonne; the Counts of Toulouse, Auvergne; of Périgord, Poitou; and Berry, the provinces between the Garonne and the Loire. The whole country north and east of the latter river belonged to the Count of Forez, the Duke of Burgundy, the Duke of France, and the Counts of Flanders and Brittany, who exercised regal powers over their territory. To the king there remained only a few towns which he had not as yet been forced to give away as fiefs.

This rending of the state was continued even within the large fiefs. The dukes and counts were all as powerless as the king against the Northmen and Saracens, and the people whom the kings had failed to unite in common endeavour gradually fell into the habit of depending on themselves. After fleeing for long at the approach of the pagans into the woods among the fallow deer, a few stout-hearted men turned and refused to abandon all their possessions without trying to defend them. Here and there in mountain passes, at fording places in rivers, on the hill which overlooked the plain, entrenchments and ramparts were built which the brave and strong defended. According to an edict of 862, the counts and vassals of the king were ordered to repair the old castles and to build new ones. The country was soon covered with them, and the invaders constantly hurled themselves in vain against them. Some defeats served to temper their daring with prudence; they dared not venture so far into the midst of these fortresses which sprang up on all sides, and the new invasion, thus rendered hazardous and difficult, ceased in the following century. The lords of these castles were later the terror of the countryside, but they had in the first place been its saviours. Feudalism, so oppressive in its age of decadence, then served a useful purpose. All power was established by rightful use, but overthrown by abuse.

Power of the Church.—In the ninth century monarchy was in its decline, feudalism was advancing; one had lost its force, the other had yet to come to its full strength. The Church alone enjoyed its full strength, it lacked nothing; greater enlightenment and morality, the ardent faith of peoples, rich domains; in short, if the whole country should be divided and if civil and political society should crumble away, unity would still abide in the ecclesiastical body, as also the energy which animated it in

the fifty-six councils assembled in France during the thirty-four years' reign of Charles the Bald. The bishops, founding upon the right of the Church their claims of examining into the conduct of all men guilty of sin in order to reform or to punish, logically claimed that they might depose kings and dispose of crowns. Thus they were not only the ministers of religion ; in that age they shared in the administration of the state. From the time of Charlemagne, who had given them a share in the government of his empire, they were mixed up with all matters, and spoke everywhere with authority. It was they who put down and set up again Louis the Pious, who decided at Fontanet which was the side of justice. In 879, Charles the Bald, threatened with deposition by certain bishops because he violated the capitularies, could find no answer to this pretension, if only for the reason that, " consecrated and anointed with the sacred chrism, he may not be deposed nor supplanted until he has been heard and tried by the bishops who consecrated him king." Hincmar, Archbishop of Reims, the most eminent man of the period, haughtily claimed from him that right.

It was fortunate that the Church was so powerful in such a period, for, when all was yielded to the strongest, she reminded men that justice should reign over strength ; to the aristocratic principle of feudal organisation she opposed the principle of the brotherhood of men. In place of hereditary right and primogeniture, which prevailed in civil society, she herself adopted the elective idea and proclaimed the rights of intellect. If the prerogative of deposing kings, which she claimed, was a usurpation of civil authority, it must be remembered that the latter had no counterpoise but the power of the bishops, and the weak and oppressed had no other guarantee save the protection of churches.

Miscellaneous Facts.—Between 836 and 857 appeared the *False or Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*, which were long regarded as genuine. They were extremely favourable to the authority of the papacy, greatly extending the right of appeals to Rome, with the result that they impaired episcopal authority. They reserved to the pope alone the power to judge bishops and established the immediate jurisdiction of the holy see over greater cases, " in favour of all the oppressed to whom the holy see owes the duty of succour, of all wrongfully condemned to whom it owes the duty of making restitution." Numerous councils

were held in this period in order to recover property which had been usurped from the Church. The Council of Troyes decided that the bodies of excommunicants should remain unburied. In 864, the Edict of Pistes forbade the slave trade, which indicates that though the majorty of slaves had already become serfs, the institution had not wholly disappeared; traces of slavery may be found as late as the thirteenth century. One article of this edict orders the destruction of castles, "because they have become the resort of robbers and because from them the peoples of the neighbourhood have suffered great vexations and pillage." None the less the number of castles increased.

FIFTH PERIOD—FEUDAL FRANCE

(887–1180)

CHAPTER XVI

THE LAST CAROLINGIANS AND THE DUKES OF FRANCE (887–987)

Weakness of the Monarchy.—Only three-quarters of a century had passed since the illustrious founder of the second empire of the West had been laid to rest in the vaults of his basilica at Aix-la-Chapelle, and already there had ceased to be either an empire or an emperor; even monarchy had signed its active abdication at Kiersy. The King of France was a mere figure-head, yet his useless title was for many years the object of much contention. The whole of the tenth century was taken up with the quarrel of the two houses who fought over the pitiful crown of the last descendants of Charlemagne; discords which proved doubly fatal, since they favoured the invasions of new barbarians and the progress of feudalism.

Election of Eudes, Duke of France (887–898).—After the deposition of Charles the Fat, Count Eudes was elected king. He had bravely defended Paris against the Northmen, and in recognition of his services had received from the emperor the duchy of France, or rather, Charles had confirmed him in possession of that large fief. He was the son of Robert the Strong, celebrated in the time of Charles the Bald for his services against the same enemies, and ancestor of all the Capetians. But the royalty of Eudes was only recognised by the nobles who dwelt between the Loire and the Meuse. Beyond the Meuse reigned Arnulf, King of Germany, who, in 895, created a kingdom in Lorraine for his son, Zwentibold; and south of the Loire, Rainulf, Duke of Aquitaine, assumed the title of king. At this time the kingdom of Provence was divided in two: Cisjurane Burgundy (Franche-Comté, Dauphiné, Provence), under Louis, son of King Boso, and Transjurane Burgundy (Switzerland as far as the Reuss, Le Valais, and part of Savoy), under Rudolf, son of a Count of Auxerre. Thus there were five kings in France. Presently a sixth arose, Charles the Simple; not to mention the

kings of Navarre, a state which was now entirely separate, and the kings of the Bretons, who were not likely to become more amenable now that she was ruled by an upstart than when a grandson of Charlemagne demanded obedience from them. Moreover, she suffered from the constant and terrible visitations of the Northmen, who never left her soil, and of the Saracens, who in 889 settled at Frejus, on the coast of Provence.

Success of Eudes against the Northmen.—Eudes skilfully contended with all these enemies. He took back neither Lorraine nor the two kingdoms of Burgundy, he neglected the Bretons who were at that time torn by civil war, ignored Navarre which was far off, and consented to recognise as a species of suzerain the Carolingian Arnulf, King of Germany, in whom imperial ambition survived in spite of the great protest of 887. But he forced the Duke of Aquitaine to renounce his title of king and to swear fealty to him, and gained two victories over the Northmen, one in the forest of Montfaucon in Argonne, the other near Montpensier in Limagne in 892. While it is impossible to place complete reliance upon the exaggerated accounts of these battles, which the poet Abbo has left us, there is no doubt that they were brilliant successes. But they produced no lasting results. The pagans were too thickly scattered over the country for the defeat of one of their bands to intimidate the others. At that very time they took and sacked Meaux, Troyes, Toul, Verdun, Evreux, and Saint-Lô. "The prophecy of the Lord," said the synod of Metz, "is coming to pass; strangers will ravage your land under your eyes, and will make of it an arid waste." Devastation, indeed, spread farther every day; food was an exorbitant price, cattle were scarce, and in many parts of the country there was no grain to sow the fields.

Rivalry of Eudes and of Charles the Simple (893).—To the evils caused by the new barbarians were shortly added those of civil war. The Count of Flanders refused allegiance to Eudes; another lord, kinsman to the king, took possession of Laon. Eudes recaptured the town and, to intimidate the factious, caused the rebel to be beheaded. He then found himself faced by another and more serious war. The partisans of the Carolingian dynasty set up a posthumous son of Louis the Stammerer who was surnamed, on account of his slow wits, Charles the Simple, and he was consecrated by the Archbishop of Reims (893). His supporters, the Duke of Burgundy and the Counts of Vermandois, Poitiers, and Auvergne, only sought in reality to bring about the ruin of the monarchy and to confirm themselves

in the positions which they had usurped. Eudes was supported by his numerous vassals of the duchy of France, and by those who had preferred a national king to that adventurous dynasty which troubled far less about saving France from the pagans than about seizing some Carolingian crown. Eudes presented himself before Reims with such forces that his opponent fled for refuge to Arnulf of Germany. The latter, forgetting his treaty with Eudes, ordered the counts and bishops of Lotharingia to restore to his hereditary kingdom this man who was of his own family. But the counts refused. Zwentibold, who had become their king in 895, involved them in a war which proved disastrous for him. He was forced to return to Lorraine, and Eudes put an end to that quarrel by granting several demesnes to his rival. This brave and energetic prince unfortunately died young, at the age of forty. His brother, Robert, inherited his duchy of France and Charles the Simple succeeded him as king without opposition.

Charles the Simple (898–992): Establishment of the Northmen in France (912).—Charles the Simple was celebrated for his misfortunes. In 912, he ceded to Rollo, a Northman chief, the province which took the name of Normandy, and which the new duke brought to a flourishing condition by his wise administration. This treaty, signed at St. Clair-sur-Epte, was fortunate since it put an end to the devastations which had lasted for a century. The new rulers of the country mixed with the old inhabitants, forgot their own language and ferocity, but still retained some of that spirit of adventure and love of gain which had led them to traverse so many countries and which enabled them to acquire first the south of Italy and, later, England.

Charles the Simple had promised to Rollo the hand of his daughter Gisela in marriage, on condition that he would renounce the worship of Odin. The new duke was baptised at Rouen, and his companions followed his example (912). He is credited with having systematically divided the country between them, and with having established in it such good order that having left one of his bracelets, as the story goes, among the branches of an oak on which he had rested while on a hunting expedition, that bracelet remained there for three years, no one daring to touch it. Blessed with peace and order, cultivation was revived in that rich province; personal slavery was early abolished, and, by a curious revolution, those who first spoke the best French were these Norman dukes, and it was in Normandy that the feudal system was most completely established,

the most flourishing monastic schools founded. There, moreover, originated that new art which was to raise such glorious monuments in Gothic architecture.

Elections of Robert, Duke of France, and Raoul, Duke of Burgundy (923–936).—In the year 912, when Charles lost a province he gained a kingdom. The Lotharingians submitted to him, but his weakness and his reliance on favourites angered the nobles. In 920, at the Assembly of Soissons, the lords declared that they would no longer obey the king if within the space of a year he did not reform his conduct and banish his minister, Hagano. At the same time, the Lotharingians deprived him of the crown which they had given to him. The warning was useless; but the nobles kept their word, and in 912 they crowned Robert, Duke of France. A battle took place near Soissons in the following year between the two princes; Charles was defeated, but his rival was killed. He gained nothing by that, for Raoul, Duke of Burgundy, the son-in-law of Robert, succeeded him. Thus dukes of France or Burgundy, the chiefs of the centre of ancient Gaul, aspired to retain the succession of the crown, and they succeeded in spite of the opposition of the lords of the north and south.

Germany, more faithful to the house of Charlemagne, rendered some assistance to Charles against his new adversary; but he failed to recover possession of his crown. Treacherously taken prisoner by Herbert, Count of Vermandois, he was confined in the castle of Peronne, where he died in 929. Raoul reigned for seven years longer without much distinction, despite two expeditions into Aquitaine and Provence from which he secured promises of fealty but nothing more. In 926, he repulsed an invasion of new barbarians, the Magyars or Hungarians, who emerged from the east as the Northmen had come from the north and west, and the Saracens from the south. The cession of Normandy to Rollo, and of Tours, Chartres, Blois, and Senlis to other chiefs, ended the ravages of the northern pirates. As for the Saracens, their devastations were chiefly confined to Provence. They maintained themselves there for eighty-four years. Their chief establishment was at Fraxinatum (La Garde-Freynet in Var), which was not taken from them until 973. The Hungarians, more numerous than the Saracens, fortunately appeared only at rare intervals in Lorraine, Burgundy, and even in Aquitaine. Germany took it upon herself to check them.

Louis IV. d'Outre-Mer (936–954).—On the death of Raoul, Hugh the Great, his brother-in-law and Duke of France, scorned

to become king, and recalled from England a son of Charles the Simple, Louis IV., surnamed d'Outre-Mer on account of this circumstance. The courage and activity of this prince were of no avail. He obtained the support of a few nobles who, jealous of the power of the Duke of France, had secured the duchy of Burgundy from his protégé. But when, in order to restore his demesne, he attempted to despoil the sons of the Count of Vermandois, and later the young heir of the Duke of Normandy, Hugh took up arms to check this unexpected flight of ambition, and Louis, defeated and taken prisoner, was retained in captivity for a whole year. Hugh did not release him from his confinement until the unfortunate king had ceded to him his only remaining town, that of Laon. Louis complained to the pope and the King of Germany, and a council excommunicated the Duke of France who, however, braved all threats, including a formidable invasion on the part of Otto the Great, the Duke of Normandy having allied himself with Hugh of France (946). Louis was reduced to the necessity of saying, in 948, at the Council of Ingelheim which was assembled by Otto: "If any one considers that my misfortunes have arisen from any fault of mine, I am ready to accept the sentence of the synod and of the king here present, or to repel the accusation by the judgment of God in single combat." No champion offered himself to represent the Duke of France. But this habit of appealing to a foreign prince, of which Charles the Simple had given an example, succeeded in rendering national, at any rate in the north of France, the opposition of the Capetian house to the last kings descended from Charlemagne.

Lothaire and Louis V. (954–987).—In 954, as the result of a hunting accident, Louis IV. ended "a life filled with anguish and tribulation" at the age of thirty-four. His brother-in-law, Hugh the Great, still did not desire this crown of France which he could so easily have secured, but gave it to his nephew Lothaire, the son of Louis. This prince certainly displayed some vigour. The attempt of Otto to restore the empire rallied round the King of France the great vassals of many districts who all aimed at preventing, either in France or Germany, the return of the old imperial power which would have lost to them all that they had won by usurpation since the time of Charlemagne. Lorraine was in this condition. The lords of that country called in Lothaire against Otto II. Hugh the Great was dead, but his son, Hugh Capet, was devoted to Lothaire, who had dearly bought fealty from the house of France by giving it Burgundy,

which it kept, and Aquitaine, which it was unable to secure. Lothaire penetrated to Aix-la-Chapelle where he received the submission of Lotharingia. Otto II., in his turn, made his way to Paris, ravaging the country. But his retreat was disastrous, and almost all his army perished on the banks of the Aisne. It was a great thing for Lothaire to have coped with so powerful a monarch; obliged to abandon upper Lorraine (890), he at least obtained for his brother Charles the duchy of lower Lorraine or Brabant. He died in 986. His son, Louis V., died in the following year as a result of a fall from his horse having done nothing which could go down to history, for which reason the old chroniclers gave him the surname of "fainéant." With him died the Carolingian dynasty in France.

The last descendants of Charlemagne had displayed more energy and activity than the last descendants of Clovis, and they deserved to come to a better end. The reason of their weakness was the great misery they suffered through the establishment of hereditary fiefs. It has been seen that they were reduced to the bare possession of the little town of Laon. Thus they had no means of rewarding services; neither lands, for they had no demesnes; nor money, for they levied no public taxes; nor offices, feudalism having taken everything. They were, therefore, gradually forsaken. In their isolation they sought external help; they became the friends of the foreigner. The invasions of the Germans in their favour accomplished the ruin of their cause, and prepared the peaceful accession of a new dynasty, more French, more national.

CHAPTER XVII

THE FIRST FOUR CAPETIANS (987–1108)

Hugh Capet founds the Third Dynasty (987–996).—Louis V. had an uncle, the Carolingian Charles, Duke of Lower Lorraine or Lothier (Brabant, Liége, etc.), and consequently a vassal of the King of Germany. But Hugh Capet, eldest son of Hugh the Great, the Duke of France, Count of Paris and Orleans, and, moreover, Abbot of St. Martin at Tours, of St. Denis, and St. Germain des Prés, that is to say, having the disposal of the revenues and influence of the three richest abbeys in France, decided at length to take the title of king which his father had scorned. He was brother to the Duke of Burgundy and brother-

in-law to the Duke of Normandy. These princes met the principal lords and bishops of France at Senlis, rejected Charles of Lorraine, whose close alliance with the Germans caused them to regard him as a foreigner, and proclaimed Hugh Capet, who was consecrated at Noyon. "The kingdom was not gained by hereditary right," said Adalbéro, Archbishop of Reims, "but by noble blood and by ability"; and he proposed the election of the man who had protected him against the threats of Lothaire, and who was only known as the *great duke*. Even in Lothaire's lifetime, just as Pope Zachary had condemned the ancient dynasty two and a half centuries earlier, Silvester II. said, "Lothaire is king in name, but Hugh is king in fact and by his deeds." And it was even believed that the saints themselves sided with the new dynasty; Hugh Capet built a chapel to St. Valery, the saint having appeared to him and said, "You and your descendants shall reign until the remotest posterity."

Absorption of a Great Fief in the Royal Demesne. — Hugh Capet founded a new house which for many centuries occupied several European thrones. But the name of king in the tenth century implied so little real power that the close of the Carolingian dynasty and the accession of the third royal race caused little sensation in the outlying provinces. They simply regarded it as the end of a secular conflict and of endless bickerings. It was, nevertheless, an event of importance. France broke definitely with Germany and the empire; moreover, the crown was thus annexed to a large fief. The king at least became, as Duke of France, Count of Paris, Orleans, etc., the equal of the most powerful nobles. Circumstances thus assisted him and he prosecuted the rights of his title.

As early as the first year of his reign, with a shrewdness which led to serious consequences, he caused his son to be consecrated king, and prevented the return of those electoral assemblies from which he had derived his royal position, but from which —had they been repeated as frequently as beyond the Rhine— anarchy such as was suffered in Germany for five or six centuries would have arisen in France.

Opposition to the New King.—The Assembly of Senlis was not attended by all the great nobles of France; the counts of Flanders, Vermandois, Troyes, and no doubt those of Poitiers and Toulouse, failed to appear. They declared themselves for Charles of Lorraine, but upheld his cause inadequately. Charles, defeated after a war which lasted two and a half years, was taken and confined in the town of Orleans, where he died the

following year. Hugh Capet was less fortunate in Aquitaine. He indeed conquered the Count of Poitiers, who payed him homage, but this prince was himself defeated by Adelbert, Count of Périgord, who advanced as far as the Loire to besiege Tours. Hugh ordered him to desist from this enterprise, and on the refusal of Adelbert to obey him, he sent a messenger with the following question : " Who made you count ? "—" Who made you king ? " answered the proud lord. Hugh Capet did not obstinately insist on the submission of these unmanageable Aquitainians ; he allowed them to recognise as king the son of his rival, Charles of Lorraine, or rather, to sign their charter with these words, *Deo regnante*, during the reign of God, until we have a king.

Forced Inaction of the First Capetians.—They were destined to wait for two centuries for this king, until the time of Philip Augustus, who at last restored to the monarchy a part of the rights and power which it had lost. During the first half of this period of two centuries there were kings, but they did not reign ; they possessed a title, dignity rather than any strength or power. The first three successors of Hugh Capet occupied the throne for a hundred and twelve years (996–1108), hardly leaving any record in history but their names.

It must, however, be remembered that the first Capetians were seriously handicapped. Since the conversion of fiefs into hereditary possessions had split up the territory, and the hereditary succession to offices had divided authority between many, there remained to the king neither enough material power nor enough influence to enable him to act beyond his own domains in any other way than as suzerain. In virtue of this suzerainty, he held together by feudal ties various provinces which would otherwise have parted asunder. Like other feudal lords, he lived on his domains ; he presided over his court of justice, plenary court, and parliament ; made the circuit of his towns, and spent his time of leisure in repeated acts of devotion, in long hunting expeditions in the forests which once more clothed the land, or in war against some neighbouring baron. In the rest of the kingdom each cared for himself. The nobles on their own estates made laws and waged war, judging and executing without any interference from the king. The last capitulary, that is to say, the last general law for the whole kingdom, dated from the time of Charles the Simple, and the oldest title deeds which have come down to us from the third dynasty are posterior to the year 1100. Moreover, they were merely private

charters until the reign of Philip Augustus. No document of general interest can be discovered prior to the year 1190.

Alliance of the First Capetians with the Church.—These princes followed the example of the first Carolingians and allied themselves with the Church. If the results of this alliance were not as brilliant as those secured by Pippin and Charlemagne, the Church at least consecrated and popularised their right. Until the days of Philip Augustus each king took care to have his eldest son consecrated in his lifetime. Hugh Capet never wore the crown, but he wore the cap of the Abbot of St. Martin of Tours, and gave back to the Church many abbeys which he possessed. Robert was a veritable saint; and in spite of a few acts of severity on the part of the pope, the princes of the new dynasty merited the surname, "the eldest sons of the Church," awarded them by grateful Rome.

Robert (996–1031): His Excommunication (998). — Hugh Capet died in 996 at the age of fifty-four. Robert, whom he had associated with him during his lifetime, began his reign amid universal terror. It was a belief that, according to a passage in the Apocalypse, the end of the world would occur in the year 1000. Accordingly donations to the Church were multiplied, piety increasing with fear. To the end of his life, Robert never forgot the impressions of the first years of his reign. He was a monk rather than a king, spending much time and energy in charity and singing hymns, but very little in producing order in the state, which, in point of fact, he was totally incapable of doing. But his peace was disturbed by an excommunication pronounced against him by the pope for having married Bertha, his kinswoman. In spite of his piety, Robert at first resisted the thunders of Rome. But the terror caused among the people by the pontifical sentence was so great, says a writer of the period, that all men fled at the approach of the king. There only remained with him two servants to prepare his food, and they purified by fire all the vessels which he had touched. Robert surrendered; he renounced Bertha and married Constance.

Queen Constance and the Aquitainians.—This imperious woman, whom the king himself came to fear, was daughter of the Count of Toulouse. She brought with her some troubadours who charmed all the courts of the south of France with their verses. But these Aquitainians, by their elegance, luxury, and easy morals, shocked the northern French, and a curious proof of the antipathy of the two races is found in the following

narrative of the writers of that period: "No sooner did Constance appear at court," says Raoul Glaber, "than France was overrun by the vainest and most hare-brained creatures that ever walked the earth. Their manner of living, their dress, their armour, and the harness of their horses were equally fantastic. Their hair hardly grew to the middle of their heads; they were veritable actors whose shaven chins, long stockings, ridiculous boots ending in a long point bent back, whose whole grotesque exterior bore witness to their lack of mental balance. Men without faith, without law, without shame, whose contagious example corrupted the French nation, formerly so modest, and dragged her into all kinds of debauchery and crime." In studying the crusade against the Albigenses, to understand something of the appalling character of that war, it is necessary to remember these old prejudices of the northern French against those of the south.

Constance, "who never jested," said Helgaud the monk in his touching history of Robert, "Constance was the scourge of the good king." He hid his alms-giving from her, and she incited to rebellion Hugh, her eldest son, who died in 1025, and later, Henry, her third son.

Importance Abroad of the Title of King of France: Acquisition of the Duchy of Burgundy (1016).—From afar the title of King of France was deceptive. During the preceding reign, Duke Borel, who commanded in the March of Spain, and who was threatened by the Saracens, had invoked the help of Hugh Capet, as formerly the emirs of Saragossa and Huesca implored that of Charlemagne. When the Italians wished, on the accession of Conrad I., to throw off the German yoke, they offered their crown to Robert. The nobles of Lorraine at the same time proposed to recognise him as their overlord. Robert, fearful of so great an honour, hastened to refuse. He was right as far as Italy was concerned, but wrong in the case of Lorraine. No doubt this refusal arose from a just appreciation of his weakness. This king, nevertheless, acquired the duchy of Burgundy after a five years' war (1016). The royal house was thus in possession of two of the great fiefs, the duchies of France and Burgundy. Unfortunately, Henry, who succeeded his father as king, was unable to keep the latter.

Persecution of the Jews (1010): First Heretics Burned (1022).—Notable events in the reign of this prince were an insurrection of the serfs of Normandy in 997, a cruel persecution of the Jews in retaliation for the destruction of the church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem by the Fatimite Khalif of Egypt, and the first

execution of heretics in France. Thirteen of these unfortunate people were burnt at Orleans (1022). One of them had been confessor to Queen Constance. As he passed near her on his way to the stake she put out one of his eyes with a small stick which she held in her hand. Other executions took place at Toulouse and elsewhere. Heresy raised the indignation of the faithful and the Church, but it testified to a certain mental activity. Even these digressions of the intellect from the beaten path proved that the country was no longer wholly devoid of the reasoning faculty. The eleventh century saw the beginning of the first *Renaissance*.

"Robert," said the chronicle of St. Denis, "departed to eternal life while copying the necrology of Melun." This town, which also witnessed the death of Philip I. and the birth of Philip Augustus, often served as residence to St. Louis, and was a second capital for the first Capetians.

Henry I. (1031–1060) : Foundation of the First Capetian House of Burgundy.—Henry I. was only the third son of Robert ; one of his elder brothers was dead, and the other, "being imbecile, was not made king." This time the Duke of Aquitaine assisted at the coronation. The Capetian house was taking root in the country. Henry was doomed to suffer from his mother's ambition. Constance wished the crown to pass to her fourth son, Robert, and Henry was only able to free himself from this rivalry by ceding Burgundy to his brother. This Robert was the ancestor of the first Capetian house of Burgundy, which lasted until the year 1361. Henry had next to disperse a rebellion formed by his other brother Eudes, whom he captured and imprisoned in the castle of Orleans (1041).

Indolence of Henry : His Marriage with a Russian Princess.—This reign of thirty years was devoid of events. "We saw," said a contemporary, "the inertia of Robert, we now see that of his son, the kinglet Henry, heir to his father's indolence." Indeed, excepting for a few expeditions into Normandy, for the most part disastrous, Henry I. accomplished nothing. In 1046, he refused the offer made to him by the Duke of Upper and Lower Lorraine to be recognised as suzerain, and allowed the Count of Flanders to transfer his homage to Germany.

The most remarkable act of this reign was the king's marriage with a daughter of the Grand Duke of Russia. Henry had chosen a princess of so remote a house in order to be quite sure that he would not find himself related to her within the degrees prohibited by the Church. Anne, they said, was descended by

her mother, the daughter of the Emperor Romanus II., from Philip of Macedon. Her first-born took the name of the father of Alexander.

The Dukes of Normandy: The Counts of Blois and Anjou.—If royalty did nothing, it was because the lords did much. Three of these especially filled France with the clamour of their ambition and with their wars.

Robert, surnamed "the Magnificent" by the nobles, and "the Devil" by the people, usurped the ducal crown of Normandy by poisoning his brother, Richard III., with his principal barons, at a banquet. By dint of energy and courage he crushed the opposition which his crime had excited, and as disputed master of Normandy he interfered with all his neighbours. He upheld King Henry against his brother, which gained for him in return the French Vexin. He attempted to deprive Canute the Great of the throne of England in favour of his cousins the sons of Ethelred, but his fleet, being driven by a storm from the shores of England to those of Brittany, he invaded that land and forced Duke Alan to pay him homage (1033). In 1035, seized with remorse, he sought rest for his conscience at Jerusalem. He died on his return journey in Asia Minor. There is still to be seen on one of the most beautiful sites of Normandy, overlooking Rouen, a hill bearing a few shapeless ruins. These are the remains of the castle of Robert the Devil, which, according to legend, was long haunted by evil spirits; it was not far from this spot that John Lackland is said to have stabbed his nephew.

The son and successor of Robert the Magnificent was the celebrated William the Bastard, who had great difficulty in obtaining the obedience of his vassals. The Battle of Val des Dunes, near Caen (1046), at last freed him from his adversaries. King Henry, his suzerain, had supported him against them, but soon finding the young duke too powerful, he allied with all his enemies. This was the cause of numerous conflicts between the Normans and the French (inhabitants of Ile de France), the latter generally assisted by the Angevins and Bretons. The most bloody among them was the Battle of Mortemar in 1054.

The king, upheld by the Count of Anjou, entered Normandy by the county of Evreux, while Eudes, his brother, entered the county of Caux with the cavalries of Picardy, Champagne, and Burgundy. Duke William was faced with two armies at this double invasion; those who marched against Eudes met the French who had disbanded to pillage near Mortemar. They killed some, captured others, and put the remainder to flight. Fleet

messengers brought these good tidings to the duke. "When darkness fell he sent one of his men who climbed a tree near the king's camp and began to cry with a loud voice. On being asked by the sentinels why he shrieked thus at such an hour, he answered: 'My name is Raoul de Ternois, and I bring you evil tidings. Take your waggons and your chariots to Mortemar to carry your friends who are dead, for the French came against us in order to test the Norman chivalry, and they found them stronger than they desired. Eudes, their standard-bearer, was shamefully put to flight, and Guy, Count of Ponthieu, was taken. All the others were killed or taken prisoner or, fleeing rapidly, had great difficulty in saving themselves. Carry this news at the earliest possible moment to the King of the French from the Duke of Normandy.'" The king, alarmed, retired in haste, and Geoffrey Martel was obliged to give up to William the suzerainty of Maine.

Eudes the second, Count of Blois, wished to seize the kingdom of Provence and then that of Lorraine; having restored Lotharingia, he aspired to reunite to it the crown of Italy. But a battle in the Barrois falsified the hopes of the turbulent baron; Eudes was defeated and killed (1037); his wife alone was able to recognise him amidst all the corpses with which the ground was strewn, and to pay the last honours to his remains.

A prince against whom Eudes often fought was still more renowned; this was Fulk Nerra or the Black, Count of Anjou, who made three pilgrimages to the Holy Land. During the last he caused himself to be dragged upon a hurdle through the streets of Jerusalem, naked and with a rope round his neck, flogged by two of his valets, and crying with a loud voice, "Lord, have pity on the traitor, Fulk the perjurer!" Then he undertook to return on foot, but was unable to go beyond Metz (1040). Fulk had indeed many crimes to expiate. Constance was his niece; having complained to him of one of her husband's favourites, Fulk forthwith sent twelve knights with orders to stab the favourite wherever he might be found. Of his two wives, he caused one to be burned, or, according to another story, he stabbed her himself after she had escaped death when thrown over a precipice by his orders; the other he forced by evil treatment to retire to Palestine. His son, Geoffrey Martel, was also a warrior. In 1036, he rose up in arms against his father in order to force him to give up to him the county of Anjou; but the aged Fulk defeated him and condemned him to the penalty of the *harnescar*. The rebel son was made to crawl

several miles with a saddle on his back to come to the feet of his father and implore his pardon. Geoffrey Martel, jealous of the power of the Duke of Normandy, allied with King Henry I. against him. His successors followed that policy and the kings of France found useful allies in the counts of Anjou against the Norman dukes who had become kings of England, until the very moment when these counts themselves inherited the British crown. It is said that the wife of Geoffrey Martel liked reading, but that such was then the scarcity of books that she was obliged to give two hundred sheep, five quarters of wheat, and the same quantity of rye and millet in order to obtain a manuscript containing homilies. The beautiful cathedral of Angers was begun under Fulk Nerra.

The Truce of God (1041).—To diminish the evils produced by continual private wars between the nobles, the Church put forward the following agreement, which it caused to be adopted by the majority of the princes: "From Wednesday evening to Monday morning in each week, on the great festivals, and throughout the whole of Advent and Lent it is forbidden to conduct warlike operations. This shall be the truce of God. He who infringes it will pay the penalty with his life or be banished from the country." This truce, although ill observed, was a great benefit to the people, who poured their blessings on the Church (1041).

Philip I. (1060–1108).—Philip I. was only seven years old at the time of his father's death, but King Henry had taken the precaution of having him consecrated at Reims during his lifetime. Moreover, this crown of the first Capetians was of so little importance that even though worn by a mere child no one was moved by a desire to seize it. The reign of Philip I. would have been still more devoid of deeds than that of his father had the nation been as torpid and indolent as its sovereign. This prince witnessed the subjection of southern Italy and Sicily by a few gentlemen of Coutances; the founding of the kingdom of Portugal by a Capetian of the house of Burgundy; the conquest of England by William the Bastard, Duke of Normandy; and finally, the rush of the whole of French chivalry to the crusade. He watched the accomplishment of these great deeds yet took no part in them. At last, jealous of his too powerful vassal the Duke of Normandy, he exhibited towards him, if not a highly dangerous enmity, yet a stubborn ill-will. He supported the Bretons against him and forced him to raise the siege of Dol (1075); he rendered assistance to his eldest son Robert, who had revolted against the new king, but this time

provoked a terrible war. "When will this fat man be delivered?" said he, jeering at William's corpulence. To which the Conqueror replied that he would be churched at Paris with ten thousand lances by way of tapers. He tried to keep his word. He entered the domains of the king and put everything to fire and sword. Mantes was taken and burned, including the churches where many people perished in the flames, and his skirmishers burned the villages even to the gates of Paris. Fortunately he fell ill at Mantes itself and died near Rouen.

The King of France maintained the same policy towards the successor of the Conqueror, but with the same weakness. He still supported Robert, Duke of Normandy, against William Rufus, who had usurped from his elder brother the crown of England, and sold to the latter his defection. He was well aware of the peril in which France stood, with a King of England as master, through Normandy, of the roads to Paris, but he had not the courage to make the necessary effort to plot against it.

His marriage with Bertrada, wife of the Duke of Anjou, exposed him to the further danger of excommunication with which he was visited by the Church, guardian of the moral laws. For ten years he took no notice of it. Under this indolent prince, the demesne, however, was increased by the addition of the French Vexin, the Gatinais, and the county of Bourges.

Miscellaneous Facts.—Under the Capetians, the national assemblies which Charlemagne had so often consulted, even the gatherings of lords and bishops common in the tenth century, fell into disuse through the very progress of feudalism and the ruin of central power. They did not reappear until the fourteenth century, when the king gained a decided ascendancy over the lords. The Benedictine order was reformed in 930, at Cluny, by St. Odo. In 974 came the reform of the monasteries in the province of Reims by Archbishop Adalbero. Hence the great movement of religious reform which Gregory VII. implanted in the following century over the whole of Europe originated in France. Gerbert, born in Auvergne, Archbishop of Reims and later of Ravenna, pope under the name of Silvester II., invented the pendulum clock and introduced Arabic figures into Europe.

CHAPTER XVIII

FRANCE IN THE ELEVENTH CENTURY—EXPOSITION OF THE FEUDAL SYSTEM

Three Distinct Societies.—There were in the sixth century three societies in Gaul, the Gallo-Romans, the barbarians, and the Church; in the eleventh there were also three, the lords, clergy, and serfs, each having its own customs and organisation and, up to a certain point, its peculiar language and literature; the two former were rich, powerful, and active, the latter oppressed and miserable.

1. Feudal Society: Fiefs and Vassals.—It has been seen that the Edict of Mersen in 847 allowed every free man to choose a lord; that the Edict of Kiersy decreed in 877 the hereditary succession of fiefs and royal offices. These edicts sanctioned a revolution begun long before, which it will be well to study more closely. It gave birth to an entirely new social order which, after having reigned supremely over Europe during several centuries, has not yet completely disappeared. In the very country where an organisation founded on other principles replaced feudalism, the Middle Ages handed down customs which proved to be stronger than the new laws. Modern nobility is an ever-living remnant of feudal times.

There had been, under the Merovingians, two principal kinds of properties: *allodial*, lands free from taxes and dues "owing relief only to the sun," as the ancient formulas express it; and *benefices*, lands charged with dues more or less numerous. He who received a *benefice* or fief was bound towards him from whom he had received it, either to personal service or to payment in kind, in exchange for which he could rely on the protection of the grantor. The most important of these obligations was that of military service.

Allodial Estates converted into Benefices: Commendation.—In the midst of a society given to all kinds of violence, the proprietors of allodial lands, free from any obligations but isolated and therefore living in greater danger, sought protection from the great and *commended* themselves to some powerful man in the neighbourhood. The commendation was the act by which a proprietor of allodial lands made a fictitious cession of his land to the protector whom he had chosen, to receive it again at his

hands not as an allodial estate, but as a benefice, with all the obligations of military service and payment in kind to which beneficiary property was bound. This practice became general. Charlemagne himself contributed to make it so by the obligation which he imposed on every free man of choosing for himself a lord and of remaining faithful to him. By this means he aimed at establishing his control over a society which preserved a taste for barbarous independence, and introducing order into it by giving it a hierarchy. But it so happened that whilst working for order he was working against his own power, or rather against the power of his successors, for he himself was unassailable. In order to safeguard the rights of imperial authority, he demanded a direct oath from free men. Louis the Pious took the same measure at the beginning of his reign ; at the end of it he found great difficulty in renewing it ; as for his sons, the idea did not even occur to them. At that period, free men had no connection with any lord except him on whom they were dependent; they did not even know the name of royal authority, the effects of which they never felt.

As proprietors practised commendation, land, which is permanent, soon came to be of more importance than man, who passes away and dies. It was not so much that a weak man commended himself to a stronger, but that a small estate commended itself to a large domain, and certain formulae symbolised this new relation ; the estate in a sense placed itself in the power of a great proprietor in the shape of a clod of turf or the branch of a tree which the petty proprietor deposited with him. There lay the germ of feudal relations. Towards the end of the reign of Charles the Bald the revolution was accomplished ; the whole country was composed of benefices or fiefs, that is to say, all lands were dependent on other lands, every man on some other man. The former was the mediate fief held by a vassal ; the latter was the immediate fief held by a suzerain or lord.

Hereditary Possession of Benefices.—One day Charlemagne reproached his son Louis, King of Aquitaine, for not having tried to attach his subjects to him by presents and grants of land. "You only give them your blessing," he added slyly, jesting at the piety of his son, "yet even if they ask you for that, it is not enough." The King of Aquitaine answered that he had nothing left to give, because the *leudes* refused to give back the benefices which they had once received and had bequeathed to their heirs. Charlemagne answered that he ought not thus to allow royal domains to be usurped, but should wrest them from those

who had appropriated them. Nevertheless as a prudent sovereign and a good father of his family he did not wish to compromise the popularity of his son, and himself undertook a task which would have been dangerous for any one else ; he sent out agents in his name to evict all holders of benefices which were detained illegally. Therein lies the whole explanation of the revolution of that period. Obstacles which Charlemagne could break down were insurmountable for his feeble successors. In their reigns, the hereditary possession of benefices acquired the force of custom, became a right, and this right was legally recognised from the year 877.

Hereditary Right in Public Functions or Offices.—The same thing occurred with regard to public offices and the titles of duke, count, and so forth, to which were attached the exercise of an authority delegated by the prince. This authority was so extensive that Charlemagne conceived the idea of strengthening his own power by giving to his agents a wider measure of authority, a course in which he was followed by his successors. But with offices as with benefices, he never overlooked too independent action on the part of his counts. He constantly appears in his capitularies as checking their attempted encroachments, rebuking their neglect, and preventing them from forgetting that he was their master. To control them better, he never entrusted more than one county to the same individual. His successors forgot this wise and vigilant policy, which would indeed have been impossible for them. Money was scarce, and public taxation no longer existing, they were obliged to pay for all services with lands or benefices. When these benefices became hereditary, the kings only possessed a few demesnes which had escaped the greed of their vassals. Devoid of money, soldiers, and lands, they could not prevent their officials from making hereditary the posts which they held. Thus, the count secured hereditary control over what was his county, that is, he secured the right of exercising over a certain extent of territory the prerogatives of regal authority which had been assigned to him. The capitulary of Kiersy-sur-Oise confirmed this usurpation. A certain idea of the state of things then existent can be gathered by imagining what France would be if prefects, magistrates, and generals could not be deprived of their offices by the government which employs them, and if they had the right to hand down to their children or, if need be, to sell, by the same right as any other property may be sold, the authority entrusted to them by the state. There was yet this

difference that the authorities of France are divided, whereas in the ninth century they were united, the count being at once the political, military, and judicial head in his county.

This usurpation of royal right gave sovereign prerogatives to every great proprietor or lord; the right of waging war, of coining money, of making laws, of judging and of executing sentences. And since this usurpation occurred in every part of the administration, being practised by duke, count, viscount, and centenier, *feudalism*, which was the name given to that regime, introduced a hierarchy of proprietors whose political rights were proportionate to those with which they had originally been invested by the king. This partly explains how a hundred and fifty great tenants-in-chief exercised at the accession of Hugh Capet the regular right of coining money, how so many others might make war as they felt inclined, legislate, and judge; but it does not suffice to explain this transformation of public powers into demesne privileges over the whole extent of the country. It must be added that every great proprietor had already, from time immemorial, private jurisdiction over his slaves, servants, colonists, and tenants, and that seignorial justice was, as expressed by Montesquieu, an ancient incident of every great property and fief. The usurpation, therefore, did not consist in the fact that the lords possessed the right of administering justice, but in the fact that they judged without appeal.

There were few proprietors in the Middle Ages; but in those days the right of property was very much more strongly established than it is at the present day, since it then included what it no longer includes, political, legislative, and judicial authority. "In those days ownership and magistracy were one and the same thing." And that characterises this period so justly described as the Middle Ages. The feudal lord, at once proprietor and sovereign, illustrates the transition from the old master, who was absolute ruler over his slaves, to the modern landowner, who has merely farmers and servants whose relations with him are determined by free conventions.

Tenants-in-Chief.—The tenants-in-chief were those who did personal homage to the king, as, for instance, the Counts of Champagne and Flanders, the Dukes of Burgundy and Aquitaine, and so forth. They exercised regalian rights over their lands, administrating, judging, and waging war without any reference to the king, who had no real power but a mere title, unless this title went with the possession of some great fief, duchy, or

county. Therein lay the whole importance of the revolution which resulted in the substitution of the Capetian house for that of the Carolingians. In 987 the royal demesne was limited to the town of Laon; by the accession of Hugh Capet this demesne included the whole duchy of France, and the king became at least equal in power to his vassals, whilst formerly his real power was inferior to that of the feeblest among them.

Feudal Hierarchy.—The owners of fiefs formed a vast association, a hierarchy which ascended from the simple knight to the king, and in which each might possess at the same time the double character of suzerain and vassal. Thus, a count, the vassal of a duke or a king, was suzerain to many viscounts, barons, or knights. The King of France was himself a vassal of the Abbot of St. Denis in virtue of an estate which he held from that abbey; the Duke of Burgundy was vassal to the Bishop of Langres; and it is seen in an old charter that thirty-two knights banneret[1] owed homage and military service to the Viscount of Thouars, who himself owed both to the Count of Anjou, vassal to the King of France. But it must not be supposed that a count was always and everywhere superior to a viscount and subordinate to a duke. Hierarchical subordination only existed within each great fief, and the Count of Anjou had nothing in common with the Duke of Burgundy, except his title of vassal of the crown of France. In many great fiefs vassals even treated their suzerain as the nobles had treated the King of France. It was the expressly recognised right of the vassal to make war against his lord when it seemed good to him, withdrawing his homage on condition that he restored to him the fief, which he generally took care not to do. Lastly, a man might at the same time be vassal to two different suzerains, and be required to render military service to both at once.

Homage, Fealty, Investiture.—Feudal relationship was established by a ceremony in which three primary formalities had to be fulfilled. The grantee of an estate knelt before the grantor, placing his hand within the hand of his future lord, and declared that he became his *man*, that is to say, that he undertook to defend his life and earthly honour; then he took the oath of fealty. The following is the formula of liege homage: "The man must place his two hands together as a sign of humility, and place them within those of his lord in token of vowing everything to him, and must promise faith; and the lord then receives him and also promises to preserve faith and loyalty

[1] A knight made in the field.

towards him ; the man must say the following words: 'Sire, I come into your homage, into all your faith, and become your man in word and deed, and swear and promise to you faith and loyalty, towards all and against all, and to defend your right to the best of my power.'" Then the lord in turn gave him the land by *investiture*, either by placing in his hands a clod of earth or a branch of a tree or, in the case of greater fiefs, a standard. "It was customary," said Otto of Freisingen, "for kingdoms to be delivered by the sword, provinces by the standard."

Suzerain and Vassal.—On the accomplishment of this triple ceremony, one became suzerain, the other vassal, and from that moment they were united by reciprocal rights and duties. The suzerain owed to his vassal justice and protection, and might not deprive him of his fief excepting in a case of forfeiture or treason.

Obligations of the Vassals.—The most important of all obligations imposed on the vassal was that of following his lord to war. The conditions on which vassals had received their fiefs determined for how many days, sixty, forty, thirty, or even less, they must render this service, and with how many armed followers. Some were only obliged to serve within the boundaries of the suzerain's territory, and for defence, not for attack. Abbots and women, who were exempt, furnished substitutes. Originally, whoever owed feudal service was accounted noble.

If the vassal was obliged to serve his lord in war, he was also obliged to help him with advice when required, and to attend his court of justice. Sharing thus in judgments, he undertook to execute with his own hand the sentence which his lips had pronounced.

There were also *feudal aids ;* the vassal was obliged to assist his suzerain to pay his ransom, to provide for the first marriage of his eldest daughter, to knight his eldest son, and to equip him for a journey to the Holy Land.

These were not the only occasions on which the suzerain exacted useful subsidies from his vassals. At every change of ownership the lord had a right to a *relief*, which was payable by the inheritor of a fief on receiving investiture. It took the shape of a sum of money, or originally a draught horse, a charger, a saddle, arms, a pair of gilded spurs, or such like.

If a vassal sold his fief, a part of the purchase money, approximately equivalent to one year's revenue, belonged to the suzerain as the right of mutation.

A fief without an heir, or confiscated for some offence,

for infidelity or treason on the part of the vassal, reverted to the lord. Therein lay the wealth of those suzerain houses which had the good fortune to endure. A part of the dominions of the crown, under the third ruling race, was comprised of fiefs which, in default of heirs, had reverted to the royal demesne.

A vassal in his minority remained under the guardianship of his lord who received the profits of the estate until he attained his majority.

Daughters could only marry a man chosen by the suzerain, unless they paid a sum of money, sometimes a considerable sum.

There were moreover moral obligations. The vassal was bound to keep the secrets of his lord, reveal to him the schemes of his enemies, help him with advice, at all times to defend him and his honour, give up his charger to him in battle should he be unhorsed, or take his place in captivity; in short, to spare neither property nor person in saving him from all peril and all shame.

These obligations fulfilled, the vassal ruled almost absolutely over his fief, and could only lose it by forfeiture, that is to say, by not conforming to the conditions of the feudal contract.

It will be noticed that the feudal system in developing made of everything a fief. Every concession—the right of hunting in a forest, of fishing in a river, of safe conduct on the roads, of escorting merchants, of the manor bakehouse in a town, in short, all useful property—was only granted on conditions of faith and homage, thus becoming a fief. The lords multiplied concessions of this description in order to increase the number of men who owed them military service. But the fief itself, to which the rights of justice were attached, generally remained undivided and passed as a whole to the firstborn.

Relations between the Vassals: Peers: Trial by Battle: Right of Private War.—Vassals under one lord were peers or equals (pares); they comprised their lord's court of justice from which appeal was allowed to the court of *his* superior lord. The formalities were neither long nor difficult. If the parties could not agree, a judicial combat, or a duel in an enclosed field, decided the side of justice and truth. The vanquished was necessarily the guilty. It was the judgment of God. When one of the parties was a woman, a priest, a child, or an old man, he might be replaced by a champion, but still ran all the risks of the fight. The defeat of the champion meant the condemnation of the person whom he represented. This appearance before the court of the suzerain seemed all too long for the pugnacious

impatience of these men. For a wrong suffered, an injury received, they immediately took up arms. This was the right of private war. It was always conducted honourably ; the enemy was warned beforehand.

All lords had not equal rights of jurisdiction. There was high, middle, and low justice, and certain nobles had only the last and second. These distinctions which did not always rest on the nature of the crimes, but sometimes on the rank of the accused, were only regularly determined at a later date. The right of high justice included the right of pronouncing death sentences, the sinister emblems of which were the pillory and gibbet raised close by the castle.

A Feudal Castle.—All political systems can, if necessary, be characterised by the place in which their power is exercised. The ancient republics had their *agora* and their *forum ;* the great monarchy of Louis XIV. had its palace of Versailles, in which dwelt all that was then called France ; feudal lords had their castles. They were generally enormous round or square structures situated on eminences in order to command a wide view, massive, devoid of architecture or ornament, and pierced only by a few loopholes from which arrows were shot. They consisted sometimes, as at Montlhéry, of five concentric circles, each overlooking the next. " The door," said a modern chronicler, who, by dint of much learning, had rendered himself almost a contemporary of those bygone ages, " the door, flanked with turrets and surmounted by a tall guardhouse, was entirely covered with heads of wild boars and of wolves. Through three enclosures, over three moats, and three drawbridges, the great courtyard was reached, in which were the cisterns, and on right and left, the stables, poultry-houses, dovecots, and coachhouses. The cellars, vaults, and prisons were underneath ; overhead the bedrooms, storehouses, larders or salting-rooms, and armouries. The whole structure was surrounded with loopholes, parapets, paths along the top of the walls, and watch towers. In the midst of the courtyard was the donjon, in which the archives and treasure were secured. It was surrounded by a deep ditch and could only be entered by the bridge which was almost always raised ; although the walls were, like those of the castle, over six feet in thickness, it was protected to half its height by a second wall of massive freestone.

" By being raised, the drawbridge covered the gate of the castle, which was further defended by the *portcullis*, a heavy iron grill sliding in grooves, which could be let down in time of need. At

the corners of the fortress great towers arose, ornamented with battlements which protected the defenders of the place against the darts shot from outside, and with *machecoulis*, a kind of parapet, the lower part of which was pierced with holes from which boiling water and blazing pitch could be poured over the assailants who reached the foot of the wall. The donjon was always built at the point most difficult of access, to hold and overlook the whole place, generally rising in the middle, as may still be seen at Vincennes; sometimes it joined the ramparts as in the château of Coucy. Immense subterranean passages opened a way far out into the plain or forest."

The Troubadour and the Trouvère.—Men who lived in such an abode needed some way of escape from the sadness and boredom of those dark vaults into which bright sunlight never found its way. But it was impossible either to fight or to hunt perpetually. The pilgrim who journeyed from afar entered for a few moments to entertain the inhabitants of the manor by pious stories and news of distant lands. But what was accounted truly good fortune was the arrival of a bard, known in the north as *trouvère*, in the south as troubadour, who, seated at the hearth of the lord, chanted to him through long evenings of the tragic adventure of the lady of Fayel and the Sieur de Coucy, or of the marvellous exploits of the knights of the Holy Grail and of the Round Table, of Renaud and Roland, of Charlemagne and his twelve peers; unless, as a relief, in the humour for merry-making, he was asked for some mocking tale in verse describing the tricks played on Master Isengrin by his crafty companion Master Renard:—

"Car ils ôtent le noir penser,
Deuil et ennui font oublier."

Tournaments.—There were also, however, games and festivals; but the games and festivals in practice among that warlike society were challenges and combats, often mortal, jousts and tournaments. Geoffrey de Preully, lord of Vendomois, who died in 1066, was, as it were, their law-giver. Only courtesy weapons, of blunted steel with neither points nor sharp edges, were brought to the tournaments; but in combats *to the death* ordinary arms were used. The judges or stewards of tournaments caused the knights to swear that they would fight honourably; and, after having measured the lances and swords and made sure that neither of the antagonists was fastened to his horse's saddle, they gave the signal for the conflict. The combatants charged each other; if their lances broke

against the shields or the steel armour, they struck each other with sword or battle-axe until one of them fell vanquished. He who did not observe the laws of combat, who struck any other part of the body than that between the arms and legs, or who dealt more blows than the judges had decreed, lost his weapons and his horse. Generally the helmet and the sword of the vanquished belonged to the victor. The prize awarded by the judges to the best striker was a tournament sword ; to him who had best defended himself they gave a helmet. The prizes were often awarded by ladies. These festivals always attracted a great concourse of princes, lords, and knights, but some of them were invariably carried from the lists dying or dead.

Arms.—Until the reign of Charlemagne, arms had been mostly offensive ; in the Middle Ages, they were chiefly defensive. From the eleventh to the fourteenth century, knights wore a coat of mail or *hauberk*, which covered the warrior from head to foot and was proof against the sword, but not against the lance. To protect himself from the latter, he wore a short coat thickly padded, the *gambeson* or *hoqueton*, or a slab of iron next to the skin, known as a *plate*. The *helmet*, of thin steel, entirely covered the head, only having narrow slits to allow of breathing and seeing, and was called *visor* or *ventail*. The helmet was only worn by knights, but all soldiers wore the iron cap fastened to the hauberk by a network of several thicknesses of iron links. The *shield* or *buckler* also acted as defensive armour. Offensive weapons were the *sword*, *lance*, *battle-axe*, *club*, and *dagger of mercy*. The infantry only had the *coutil* or knife and the bow or *arbalist* brought over from Asia in the twelfth century.

2. Religious Society: Ecclesiastical Feudalism.—The clergy themselves entered into the system of feudalism. The bishop, formerly *defender of the city*, often became its count by traditional usurpation or by special grant from kings who had united, as at Reims and many other towns, the county and bishopric, political and spiritual authority, which rendered the bishop suzerain of all the lords in his diocese. Over and above its tithes, the Church possessed, thanks to donations from the faithful, enormous wealth. To protect it from the robberies of those times the secular arm was called in to assist. Laymen were chosen, men of courage and ability to whom the domains were entrusted that they might, if need be, defend them with the sword. But these *advocates* of monasteries and churches did like the king's counts ; they rendered their offices hereditary and appropriated the

goods which had been entrusted to them. But they consented to acknowledge themselves vassals of those whom they despoiled, to render them faith and homage under the ordinary conditions of payment in kind and personal service. Abbots and bishops thus became suzerains, temporal lords, having under them numerous vassals ready to arm themselves in their cause, a court of justice, and, in short, all the prerogatives exercised by the great proprietors. Thus appeared duke-counts and bishops, themselves vassals of other lords, and generally of the king, from whom they received the investiture of goods attached to their church, or, as it was described, their *temporalities*. This ecclesiastical feudalism was so numerous and powerful that in France and England it possessed in the Middle Ages more than one-fifth of the land, in Germany nearly one-third. For there was this difference between the Church and the king, that the latter, having achieved the conquest, received nothing more, while he was obliged constantly to make gifts, with the result that he eventually possessed only the town of Laon; whereas the Church, if she lost some estates (an improbable occurrence, because she could defend her possessions by the power of excommunication), made constant acquisitions, there being few of the faithful who died without leaving her something, as a result of which she was constantly receiving and never or rarely giving, losing only that which was seized from her by violence.

Ecclesiastical Literature.—It has been seen how the empire of the Franks was broken up on leaving the hands of Charlemagne. The same must be said of civilisation, of which the elements had been collected and brought together by his care. He was not unaware of the fact that unity of ideas is the indispensable cementer of political unity; and besides, like all great men, he longed to reign over a civilised empire rather than over barbarians. Hence those letters and capitularies in which he decrees "that schools shall be founded and attended not only by sons of serfs, but by those of free man," that is to say, not only by the children of poor country people to whom the warriors left with scorn the humble and peaceful office of clerk or monk, but those very boys who should one day succeed the warriors and carry into battle the great sword of their fathers. Such orders led to nothing less than the formation of an enlightened lay society which would have transformed the Middle Ages. But on the death of Charlemagne this nobility at school flung far from them their Latin and Teutonic grammar books, and saw with joy the

prospect of civil wars in which each might follow his own bent and all could be won by courage.

Hincmar and John Scotus Erigena.—But ecclesiastical society preserved something of the impetus given to study by Charlemagne. Under the vast edifice, crumbling in all directions but not yet overthrown, the ninth century shielded an intellectual development which was not without a certain grandeur. Hincmar replaced Alcuin, and Charles the Bald attempted to imitate Charlemagne. In 855, the law and a council strongly recommended the study of divine and secular literature; in 859 there were fresh attempts to restore the Carolingian schools, "because this interruption of studies brings ignorance of faith and dearth of all knowledge." In 882 occurs the first mention of the episcopal school of Paris, which later enjoyed so great a reputation, and in the catalogue of the library of St. Riquier for the year 831 mention is made of two hundred and fifty-six volumes, among which figure the *Eclogues* of Virgil and the *Rhetoric* of Cicero, Terence, Macrobius, and, perhaps, Trogus Pompeius, which has since been lost. There was even a movement of philosophical ideas and disputes which presaged those of the great periods of the Middle Ages. Gotheschalk the monk believed he found in the writings of St. Augustine the dogma of predestination. Defeated by Raban Maur, the wise Bishop of Mainz, a disciple of Alcuin, and condemned by two councils, Gotheschalk was confined by Hincmar in the depth of a cloister to the end of his days without having consented to recant. The celebrated John Scotus Erigena (an Irishman), charged by Hincmar to reply to him, also provoked repression by what he called his purely human and philosophical method of reasoning, a method which was in fact based upon the study of an ancient philosophy.

Further Decadence at the End of the Ninth Century and Second Renaissance of the Eleventh Century.—Political confusion became greater; the ruin of the empire was accomplished; the nobles struggled, fought, and despoiled, creating disorder at will. Amidst all this violence there was no place for intellectual activity. It could be found nowhere save in some isolated monastery, the only asylum where, in the tenth century, the last pale lights of learning lay hid to avoid the raging of the tempest. Outside, black darkness reigned; appalling misery, physical and moral, pestilence, and famine; it seemed that physical death was to take possession of the world, that intellectual death had already almost conquered it; it believed itself about to perish. On the approach of the year 1000, there was no

more building, no more repairing, no more provision for the future at least for the future here below ; men gave the clergy their lands and houses *mundi fine appropinquante*.

But this hour of anguish and unspeakable terror passed like all others. The sun rose as usual on the first day of the year 1000. Suspended life again followed its course with renewed energy. The world thanked the God who had suffered it to live by a great wave of Christian unity and religious heroism which was expressed by the chief of the Christians: "Soldiers of Christ!" cried Silvester II., the first French pope (999–1003), pointing to sacked Jerusalem, "Soldiers of Christ, arise! We must fight for Him!" Before the century had drawn to a close, millions of men had responded to this appeal.

In the meantime every one set to work ; the earth seemed to have thrown off its old age and to be clothed in a white splendour of new churches. Basilicas were rebuilt, monasteries founded. In eight centuries, only 1108 had been built in France ; 326 rose in the eleventh century, 702 in the twelfth. This animation occurred also in the spiritual world. Silvester II. set the example; this simple monk of Aurillac, under the name of Gerbert, went to the Mussulmans of Spain to study letters, algebra, and astronomy and opened out to Christian Europe a new source of knowledge, Arabic science ; he collected a considerable library, constructed globes, and invented the pendulum clock, a marvel which won for him the reputation in the eyes of the vulgar of being a magician sold to the devil.

The second Renaissance took place chiefly in France, and especially in that province of Normandy where the warlike spirit of feudalism had been at its highest. There was the magnificent abbey of Fontenelle or St. Wandrille, restored by the duke in 1035; that of Jumiéges, the imposing ruins of which still stand; that of Bec, founded in 1040, which was rendered illustrious from the very beginning by the presence of the two great doctors, Lanfranc and St. Anselm ; not to mention the monasteries of Caen, Rouen, Avranches, Bayeux, Fécamp, and Mont St. Michael "in Peril of the Sea." William the Bastard was surnamed the Conqueror but also the Great Builder.

In the heart of these monasteries, the monks were no longer content to copy rare manuscripts which had survived the wreck of ancient civilisation. They were interested in the events which took place around them, and recorded them, or they were anxious to strengthen their faith by theological discussions which once more assumed a learned character. Richer, a pupil of Silvester II.,

doctor as well as monk, wrote in the abbey of St. Remi a history of the tenth century, in which he imitated Sallust as Einhard imitated Suetonius. Abbo, monk of St. Germain, chanted in somewhat clumsy verse the exploits of Count Eudes and of the Parisians against the Northmen whose history another William wrote in the abbey of Jumiéges.

Lanfranc and St. Anselm: Berengar and Roscelin —Whilst some wrote, others taught and pupils flocked to learn. At St. Stephen of Caen, the Italian Lanfranc had an audience of more than four thousand hearers. In vain did he attempt to escape the illustrious destiny which pursued him in the solitude of Bec. It placed him in spite of himself in the archiepiscopal chair of Canterbury. This awakening activity of the mind some times diverged from the beaten path. Mention has been made of the heresy which caused thirteen miserable men to be led to the stake in 1022. Another, stirred up by Berengar of Tours, disturbed the Church for more than thirty years (1050–1080). Berengar, like John Scotus Erigena, saw in the Eucharist only a memorial service, and submitted the things of faith to the test of reason. "You must resign yourself not to understand," said his friend the Bishop of Liége to him, "for can you ever understand the great mystery of God?" But Berengar wished to analyse his belief, and audaciously brought his reason to bear on all mysteries. He was one of the forerunners of Luther, although the latter knew nothing of his writings. Lanfranc was his chief adversary.

St. Anselm, an Italian like Lanfranc, succeeded him in the abbey of Bec and in the see of Canterbury. He revived dogmatic theology, which had been almost abandoned since the days of St. Augustine, that is to say, for about six centuries. He embraced with absolute faith the whole of Christian dogma, and employed, to demonstrate its truth, all the force of his powerful mind, all the resources of dialectic and the art of reasoning. He sometimes argued as closely as Descartes. The famous proof of the existence of God given by the father of modern philosophy—that the mere fact of thought proves the existence of a supreme Being—is only a reproduction of one of the arguments of St. Anselm.

St. Anselm, like Lanfranc, was obliged to cope with bold innovators who, making use of dialectic, that dangerous ally of theology, shook the dogmas by wishing to subject them to the rules of reason following the logical system of Aristotle. Berengar had attempted to interpret the mystery of the Euchar-

ist, Roscelin attacked about 1085 that of the Trinity, and dawning scholasticism began with the quarrels of the *realists* and *nominalists*, subtle discussions which rendered barren so many laborious efforts.

Art in the Church.—The Church was then not only the guardian of faith but also of knowledge. She had her doctors; she also trained and directed architects, painters, and sculptors. There was little building in the tenth century; in the eleventh, when all fear was allayed after the fatal epoch of the year 1000, the peoples, as if in an outburst of gratitude, worked throughout Christendom at the reconstruction of cathedrals; from that moment may be dated the first epoch of the grand architecture of the Middle Ages, the Roman period. Then the more graceful semicircle replaced the heavy Roman arch, the thick pillars of old Carolingian churches became suddenly lighter in build, the flat vaults became bolder, the naves of churches less dark, the towers less square. Air and light entered into the buildings as they rose towards heaven; *masters of living works* began to lend life to the stone; already the pointed arch was making its appearance, only in vaults, it is true, and not yet well proportioned owing to its solidity.

Three churches may be used as examples of this progress. That of Orcival in Auvergne, built at the end of the tenth century or the beginning of the eleventh, had already some measure of elegance, but lacked height and ornamentation; it possessed no principal doorway and only two entrances at the sides; as yet far from the true pointed style. The cathedral of Angoulême, of 1120, still affected the perpendicular and horizontal lines of the old system of architecture. Its front, rectangular and sparing of ornament, shows only the plain semicircle; the pointed arch is just visible in the nave. But Notre-Dame of Poitiers, of the same century, is one of the masterpieces of Roman architecture. Bas-reliefs, arches, statues, and varied ornamentation are multiplied with profusion on its rich façade which surmounts a rather prominent triangular pediment, already foreshadowing the pyramid style which was to reign in the following century.

3. The Serfs.—In the eleventh century France was covered with a multitude of fiefs, each of which formed a state having its own separate existence, its laws, its customs, its own lay or ecclesiastical chief; this noble had not only vassals, he had also subjects resident on that portion of his land which he had not enfeoffed. First of all there were the *serfs*, the *men of the land*, who were entirely surrendered to his discretion. "The overlord,"

said Beaumanoir, "may deprive them of all they possess, and may confine them in prison whenever it may please him, whether justly or unjustly, and he is only held responsible to God."

Mainmortables.—Above them came the *mainmortables*, "those treated with more consideration," continued the old jurist of Beauvais, "for the overlord may demand nothing from them if they do no evil, except their money payments, their rents and the dues which they are accustomed to pay in commutation of their services." But the *mainmortable* might not marry without his overlord's consent; if he took to wife a free woman or one born outside the seigneury, "it is meet that he make a fine at the will of his overlord." That was the right of *formarriage*. The children were equally divided between the two overlords. If there was only one he would belong to the mother's overlord. On the death of *mainmortables* all their possessions passed to the overlord. For them there was no way of escape from the hard hand which bent them to the plough. They only possessed the right of making suit which attached to their person and property. The overlord was the universal heir of his serf.

Vilains.—One degree higher in the scale were the free tenants called *vilains, manants*, or *routuriers*. Their condition was less precarious. They had kept their liberty which the serf did not possess, and held, on condition of paying an annual rent and *boon-work*, the manor lands which the proprietor had granted to them, and which they could make over with all their personal property to their children. But while the beneficiary tenures or fiefs were under the guarantee of a distinctly fixed and clearly determined law, manorial tenures were under the absolute jurisdiction of the proprietor and only guaranteed by local conventions. As a result, the *vilains*, especially those in rural districts who had not to be conciliated like those in the large towns, were themselves subjected to an authority which was generally unlimited. The following was written of the lords in an ancient document: "They are lords of sky and earth and they possess jurisdiction on and below the earth . . . over neck and head, over water, winds, and woods." The *vilain* was not able to seek judgment, for feudal law said: "Between you, lord, and you, *vilain*, there is no judge but God." "We recognise as the property of our gracious lord," said another formula, "the right of banishment and summons; the tall forest, the birds of the air, the fishes in running water, the wild beasts in the bush, as long as our gracious lord, or the servant of his grace,

pursues them. So that our gracious lord may take under his protection and support the widow and orphan as also the man of the land." Thus every right was abandoned to the lord, but in exchange he was bound to defend the weak. Such was the principle of feudal society in respect of those subject to it. Royalty no longer filled the office for which it was created; the protection which was not forthcoming from the nominal head of the state was demanded from bishops, counts, barons, and every powerful man.

Obligations of Subjects.—Everything belonged to the overlord; but as neither industry nor commerce existed, nor that luxury which allows one man to consume in a few moments the fruit of the toil of many, the exactions of the lord were not at first oppressive; as for the *vilains*, their rights were as finally fixed as the rights of a landowner with regard to his farmers are fixed to-day. In considering the Middle Ages, allowance must always be made for the part played by arbitrary power and by violence which, of course, the law did not recognise. The obligations of the *vilains* were then either payments in kind—provisions, wheat, cattle, poultry, the products of the land and farm—or physical labour, such as work on the land or in the vineyards of the lord, the building of his castle, the maintenance of moats, the mending of roads, and the making of furniture and utensils, horseshoes, ploughshares, carriages, and such like. In the towns, and wherever there was wealth, it is obvious that the lord would not hesitate to exact money dues and to impose arbitrary taxes. But in course of time such exactions were gradually abandoned; at an early date the Church declared, "The lord who takes unjust dues from his *vilain* does so at the peril of his soul"; if lords were not restrained by fear of damnation, that fear was soon reinforced by the rise of the communes and by the energetic intervention of royal authority.

There were also bizarre dues to enliven the dull life of the feudal lord, secluded all the year round within the gloomy walls of his manor. In Bologna and Italy, a tenant of the Benedictines of St. Procula payed, as his customary due, the smoke of a boiled capon. Every year he brought his capon to the abbey between two dishes, uncovered it, and when all the steam had disappeared, was allowed to depart, taking his capon back with him. Elsewhere the peasants solemnly led a little bird to the noble on a carriage drawn by four horses; or sometimes a may tree decorated with ribbons. The owner of a monkey paid his dues

according to an ordinance of St. Louis, by allowing his monkey to play before the lord's toll-gatherer; the *jongleur* merely sang a song. The lords themselves sometimes consented to take part in these popular comedies. The Margrave of Julich, on his solemn entry, was made to ride on a one-eyed horse, with a wooden saddle, a bridle of lime bark, two spurs of hawthorn, and a white staff. When the Abbot of Figeac made his entry into the town, the lord of Montbrun received him grotesquely dressed and with one leg bare.

Feudalism, weary of itself, sometimes jested with the poor; so did the Church when she authorised the celebration in her cathedrals of the festival of the Ass. The powerful and the fortunate, in those harsh and gloomy days when misery reigned everywhere and security was unknown, owed to their *vilains* and their peasants some moments of forgetfulness and mirth.

Anarchy and Violence.—The Middle Ages were indeed a harsh time for the poor when, in spite of all formulas and all conventions, the nobles only believed in the right of the sword. In theory the principles of feudal relationship were excellent, in reality they led to anarchy, for judiciary institutions were too defective to prevent the constant breaking of the bond of vassalage. In this fact is to be found the origin of those interminable wars which broke out in all parts of France, and were the great affliction of that period. It was possible for any man to draw his sword to avenge a proved wrong or a sentence which he considered unjust, a state of war was the normal condition of that society. Every hill became a fortress, every plain a battlefield. The feudal lords lived cantoned in strong castles, clothed in steel armour, surrounded with soldiers; tyrants, as monk Richer described them, who only loved battles and knew not how to enrich themselves except by pillage. Commerce was at a standstill, for the roads were unsafe; industry ceased, for the lords, masters also of the towns, levied contributions from the burghers as soon as they showed the least sign of opulence. Everywhere the customs were different, since there was no general legislation, each noble having the sole legislative power over his fief; everywhere also the most profound ignorance reigned, excepting in the heart of a few monasteries, and the clergy, guardians of moral laws, unable to prohibit violence, were reduced to the necessity of regulating it by establishing the Truce of God, which forbade killing and stealing from Wednesday evening to Monday morning.

Appalling Misery: A Famine of the Eleventh Century.—These feudal wars were not very murderous for the steel-clad noble, but they were terribly so for the peasant who fought almost without defensive armour. At Brenville, where the two kings of France and England fought, nine hundred knights were engaged ; only three remained on the field. At Bouvines, Philip Augustus fell from his horse and for some time remained defenceless in the hands of the enemy's infantry ; they vainly sought a flaw in his armour so that they might thrust a dagger into it, but the weapons which sought to pierce his cuirass were shivered into splinters against it. The knights were able at leisure to deliver him and to place him once more in the saddle, after which he rushed with them into the midst of this rabble, among whom the long lances and heavy battle-axes did not strike one blow in vain. The capture of the lord was a further affliction for the poor; a ransom had to be paid. No one paid for the burning cottage and harvest of the unfortunate poor, no one dressed their wounds, no one provided for their widows and orphans.

Two contemporary authors of the crusades described that disastrous period: "Before the Christians started for the lands beyond the sea," said Gilbert of Nogent, "the kingdom of France was a prey to perpetual disturbance and hostility. The chief subject for conversation was the robberies committed on public roads. Arson was common, and war, arising from no cause save insatiable greed, raged everywhere. In short, rapacious men respected the property of no one and indulged in pillage with unbridled audacity." And William, Archbishop of Tyre, says, "There was no security for property; if a man was suspected of being rich it was sufficient reason for throwing him into prison, holding him in bonds and subjecting him to cruel tortures. Brigands armed with swords infested the roads, laid ambushes, and spared neither strangers nor those who were consecrated to God. Even towns and strongholds were not immune from these calamities ; hired assassins rendered their streets and open places dangerous to the wayfarers."

Raoul Glaber, the chronicler, describes in the following manner a famine which raged in the year 1033, and of which he was an eye-witness: "Continual rains had flooded the earth, the harvest was lost, and old and young were obliged to feed on beasts and birds. This source having been exhausted, hunger did not become less insistent, and after having tried to satisfy it with the bark of trees or the grass in the streams, they were reduced to devouring corpses. The traveller attacked, succumbed under the

blows of his assailants ; his limbs were torn apart, grilled over a fire, and devoured. Others fleeing the country and thinking to escape the famine, received hospitality on the road, and their hosts slaughtered them in the night to provide food for themselves. Some offered children an egg or an apple to entice them away, and then sacrificed them to their hunger. Corpses were unearthed in many places to be eaten at these gruesome feasts. One miserable wretch even carried human flesh to the market to sell it cooked. Arrested, he did not attempt to deny his crime, and was strangled and thrown into the flames. Another dug up that flesh which had been buried, ate it, and was also burned."

"Three miles from Mâcon, in the forest of Chatenay, there is an isolated church consecrated to St. John. A scoundrel had built himself a hut not far from there where he murdered all the passers by. The monster then fed on their corpses. A man came to him one day to beg hospitality for himself and his wife, and rested for a few moments ; glancing into the corners of the hut, he saw the heads of men, women, and children. At once he became frightened, he grew pale and tried to leave the place. But his host barred his way. The fear of death doubled the strength of the traveller ; he escaped with his wife and ran in haste to the town to tell Prince Otto and the inhabitants of this awful discovery. A number of men were at once sent to verify the statement, and found this wild beast in his lair on their arrival with forty-eight heads of men whom he had murdered, whose flesh he had eaten. He was taken to the town, tied to a beam in a cellar, then cast into a fire. We ourselves were present at the execution."

"In the same province a trial was made of a form of food not known elsewhere. Many people mixed a kind of white earth similar to potter's clay with what remained to them of grain and flour, and out of this they made loaves to satisfy their cruel hunger. It was the only hope which remained to them of escaping death, and it did not meet with any great success. The faces of all were pale and emaciated, their skin strained and swollen, their voices shrill and calling to mind the plaintive cry of dying birds. The great number of deaths made interment impossible, and the wolves, long attracted by the smell of corpses, came and devoured their prey. As individual graves could not be provided for the dead owing to their number, God-fearing men dug deep ditches known as charnel houses, in which they buried five hundred bodies, sometimes more if there was

room. They lay there mingled pell-mell, half naked, often indeed totally devoid of clothing. The cross-roads and ditches in the fields also served as cemeteries."

This ghastly tale from an eye-witness shows what suffering was caused by the absence of commerce and administration in the Middle Ages. To-day, the spirit of order and forethought knows so well how to provide against such scourges that they have caused on the whole little misery in those places where they have occurred, and what is still better, they do not disturb public morality. In former days, nothing could guard against the vagaries of the seasons. Every poor harvest brought a dearth, every dearth a famine, crimes, and atrocities. Out of seventy years, from 970–1040, there were forty-eight years of famine or epidemic.

Favourable Characteristics of Mediaeval Civilisation.—But the general progress of civilisation can never be so entirely suspended as to render the passing of three centuries totally unfruitful for mankind. It has already been seen that thought was reawakened in the Church, that poetry appeared in secular society. Some progress was made even with regard to morality, at least among the ruling class. In the seclusion in which every one lived, exposed to all manner of perils, the soul of man acquired renewed strength to face them. The conception of the dignity of man, which had been destroyed by despotism, revived; that society which shed blood with such deplorable ease often displayed a moral greatness peculiar to the age. The lower vices, the cowardice of the Romans or of a servile race during the period of their decline, were unknown to that society; it has handed down to modern times the sentiment of honour. The feudal nobility knew how to die; that is the first step towards knowing how to live.

Another good result was the reorganisation of family life. In ancient cities, the man lived outside his house in the fields or the market-place; he hardly knew his wife and children, yet possessed the right of life and death over them. At an earlier date, the custom of polygamy and the facility of obtaining divorces had prevented the family from establishing itself upon any firm basis. In feudal society, when men lived in isolation, the father was drawn nearer to his wife and children. When he had leisure from fighting, in the heart of some castle, perched on the mountain like an eagle's nest, there was nothing to fill his life and heart but the mother of his children. The Church that had caused these rough soldiers to bow at the feet of a

Virgin, who taught them to respect in the Mother of the Saviour all womanly virtues, softened the fierce tempers of these warriors and prepared them to fall under the charm of a more refined spirit and the more delicate sentiments with which nature has endowed the feminine sex. The wife then took her place in the family, and in society that rank already assigned to her by Mosaic law. She even went further; she became the object of a cult which created new sentiments, of which the poems of troubadours and trouvères took possession and which were practised by chivalry. Thus, in the beautiful legend of St. Christopher, the strong was conquered by the weak, the giant by the child.

An institution of that period illustrates this fact. Robert d'Arbrissel founded near Saumur, at Fontevrault, about the year 1100, an abbey which was soon destined to become celebrated and which united recluses of both sexes. The women were cloistered and prayed, while the men laboured in the fields, drained the swamps, cleared the sandy wastes, and remained the perpetual servants of the women. The abbey was governed by an abbess, "because," said the bull of confirmation, "Jesus Christ, dying, gave to his mother as son the well-beloved disciple."

Outside family life, the state was no doubt badly organised. Attention must be drawn, in spite of facts to the contrary, to the political theory which this society represented. If the serf had no rights, the vassal had, and they were very extensive. Feudal ties were only contracted on conditions well known and accepted by him beforehand; new conditions could not be imposed upon him except with his consent. Thus originated those great and strong maxims of public law, which, despite many violations, have come down to modern times; no tax could be exacted without the consent of the tax-payers; no law was valid unless accepted by those who were called upon to obey it; no sentence was legitimate unless pronounced by the peers of the accused. It was the principles of feudal society which the States-Generals of 1780 discovered under the debris of absolute monarchy; and, as guarantee for these rights, the vassal had power to break the tie of vassaldom by returning his fief, or to reply by war to a denial of justice on the part of his superior lord. This right of armed resistance, recognised by St. Louis himself, conduced, it is true, to anarchy; it weakened society, but greatly strengthened the individual. And from this point progress must begin. Before attempting to establish a stable constitution for

the state, it was essential to secure the liberty of the individual and the household. This double task was the work of the Middle Ages.

The Church laboured with zeal to establish the sanctity of marriage, even for the serf. She preached the equality of all men before God, which was a threat against the great inequalities of the earth ; she proclaimed, by the principle of election which she herself preserved even in the foremost positions in her hierarchy, the rights of intellect, as opposed to the feudal world which only recognised the rights of blood ; and, finally, she crowned with the triple crown and seated on the chair of St. Peter, from which he might place his foot on the heads of kings, a serf in Adrian IV. or the son of a poor carpenter in Gregory VII.

CHAPTER XIX

FOREIGN ENTERPRISES DURING THE SECOND HALF OF THE ELEVENTH CENTURY

The Pilgrimages.—The eleventh century was a period of most ardent religious fervour among the nations. They had lately escaped from the terror caused by the approach of the year 1000 when the end of the world was expected ; and the peoples, glad to be alive, proved their gratitude by an increase of devotion. " At this time," says Raoul Glaber, the chronicler, one of the pious and brilliant spirits of the period, " new cathedrals arose on all sides, the Christian nations seeming to rival each other in their magnificence. The whole world appeared to have shaken off the rags of antiquity to clothe itself with a white robe of churches." Everywhere piety discovered relics of forgotten saints, and monasteries were raised over their tombs. On the announcement of some pious discovery, crowds flocked to the place from neighbouring provinces. They came from afar, for salvation seemed to await them at the end of their journey. Little by little they were emboldened to go still farther afield, to St. Martin of Tours on the Loire, to St. James of Compostella in Galicia, to Monte Cassino in Italy, to the tombs of the holy apostles at Rome. From there to Jerusalem they had only the sea to cross. It was perilous, but faith did not count perils. The monk Glaber declares that, from the time of King Henry, " an innumerable crowd came from the ends of the earth to visit the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem. First the lower classes

of the people, then the middle classes, then the counts, margraves, and prelates, and finally, what had never been seen before, a number of women, noble and poor, undertook this pilgrimage; many evinced the most ardent longing to die at Jerusalem rather than return to their own country." Fulk Nerra, Count of Anjou, visited it three times, the last occasion being in 1039. Robert the Magnificent, Duke of Normandy, also made this pilgrimage, and died at Nicaea (1035). The counts of Barcelona, Flanders, and Verdun undertook and accomplished the journey. In 1054, the Bishop of Cambrai went with 3000 Flemings; in 1067 four German bishops with 7000 men.

Reform in the Church by Gregory VII., who reawakens Religious Enthusiasm.—Thus the progress of the world, having remained at a standstill for two centuries through the influence of feudalism, once more advanced when Gregory VII. gave it fresh impetus, stirring up the Church and, through her, lay society. In the eleventh century the Church was too wealthy. Many of her members forgot that their lot should be that of the poor and assumed the habits of feudal lords. Discipline was relaxed and manners corrupted. The law of celibacy was no longer strictly observed and ecclesiastical offices threatened to become hereditary, as those of the state had done. They were usurped by the nobles. "The sanctuaries," said a writer of the period, "no longer ring with the chanting of psalms and praises of God, but with the clash of arms and the baying of hounds."

Hildebrand, for many years a monk at Cluny, in France, became pope in 1073 under the name of Gregory VII., and by his energy averted this danger from the Church. Through him the clergy were once more inspired with the virtues of abstinence and sacrifice; and this regenerated Church he attempted to place above temporal power. In order to bring her once more under the sole authority of the holy see, he wished none of her offices to be in the gift of laymen, but that all privileges should come from the pope; so that in according spiritual consecration to the bishop, the pope would at the same time be investing him with the lands dependent on his church. This gave rise to the Investiture Controversy, which specially affected Italy and Germany. Gregory VII. failed in this part of his great enterprise. Defeated and a fugitive, he gave utterance to these bitter words: "I have loved justice and hated iniquity, therefore I die in exile." But his influence did not die. Through him the holy see had awakened to a new life, the Church to a wider influence over the nations and over the affairs of the age. To Gregory VII.

she owed the power of accomplishing one of the most important events of the Middle Ages, that of converting the pilgrimages into crusades.

Conquest of Southern Italy by the Normans (1040–1130).—At first there were particular crusades, military expeditions undertaken under the auspices of the holy see to avert from it a danger or to re-establish its unrecognised authority. Thus Norman pilgrims, arriving at Rome towards the year 1016, were employed by the pope against the Greeks who were attacking Benevento. Others, returning from Jerusalem, assisted the inhabitants of Salerno to drive off the Saracens by whom they were besieged. The rumour of their success, and especially of the booty which they secured, attracted other Normans; they came in such force that they were strong enough to remain masters of the country. Pope Leo IX., beginning to repent of having secured such valiant neighbours, marched against them with an army of Germans. He was taken prisoner. But they remembered that the pontiff was a disposer of crowns, and that he could give the right to him who only possessed might. They knelt before their prisoner, declaring themselves his vassals, and received from him in fief all that they had conquered (1053). The pope came forth from captivity as suzerain of a new state. This was the duchy of Apulia, to which the Normans presently added Sicily; the two districts were united in 1130 under the name of the kingdom of the Two Sicilies; and a Norman dynasty, having for its chiefs Robert and Roger Guiscard, the sons of Tancred of Hauteville, a gentleman of Coutances, reigned at Naples, where the counts of Anjou also wore the crown and where the house of Bourbon later ruled supreme.

Conquest of England by the Normans (1066).—At the same time, another Norman dynasty took possession of the throne of England. The great island of Britain, conquered in the fifth century by the Angles and Saxons, was once more overcome in the eleventh by the Danes. The latter were unable to retain it for long. Edward the Confessor, a descendant of the former kings of the country, recovered the crown in 1042; but he prepared the way for the success of a new invasion by the favour which he showed to the Normans, among whom he had lived during his exile. He brought over a great number to his court, distributed the principal offices among them, and placed great confidence in his brother-in-law, Eustace, Count of Boulogne. When William II., Duke of Normandy, bastard son of Duke Robert the Devil, came to pay a visit to the Anglo-Saxon king,

he saw Normans everywhere ; at the head of troops, in the fortresses, in the bishoprics. It seemed to him that the conquest of England was half accomplished, and he returned thinking that it would be an easy matter for him to exchange his ducal coronet for that royal crown. But the Saxons had been disgusted with the ostentatious splendour which William had displayed, and with the favour shown him by the Normans, who had received him in regal state. They forced Edward to dismiss his friends from across the Channel and Harold the Saxon obtained all influence at court and throughout the country.

According to the traditional accounts of this period, Edward had formerly delivered hostages to William ; he ordered Harold to reclaim them. The duke welcomed him with all honour. One day, as they were riding together, the Norman said, " When Edward and I lived as two brothers, he promised me that if he became King of England he would make me his heir. Harold, if you help me to that, I will heap benefits upon you ; promise that you will give up to me the castle of Dover and, meantime, leave me one of the hostages." Harold promised vaguely, not daring to refuse a man who held him in his power. Arrived at Bayeux, in the presence of his court, William invited him to swear upon two small reliquaries that he would fulfil his promise. Harold swore. It seemed to him that an oath taken over two little reliquaries was not an oath of great importance. But William had deceived him ; there was, underneath, a large chest full of bones. When this was revealed to Harold he turned pale ; he feared to perjure himself over the bodies of all the saints.

His return was followed by the death of Edward. The Witenagemot, or great national council, gave him the crown. Immediately, William sent to remind him of his promise, " sworn over good and holy reliquaries." Harold replied that, extracted from him by force, it was invalid, and that, moreover, his kingship belonged to the Saxon people. William accused the Saxon of usurpation and sacrilege, and appealed to the court of Rome. Hildebrand, who was directing it, and who complained that Peter's Pence, a tax imposed on the Saxons by one of their former kings in favour of the Roman Church, had not been paid, caused Harold to be excommunicated and William to be given the kingdom of England. The pope sent him a consecrated banner, symbol of military investiture, with a ring containing a hair of St. Peter, enclosed under a diamond, emblem of ecclesiastical investiture. The duke then published his declaration of

war throughout France. Adventurers flocked to his standard, and on September 27, 1066, a considerable army embarked from St. Valery-sur-Somme in 1400 ships.

It landed at Pevensey, in the county of Sussex. Harold, who had just repelled a Norwegian invasion on the coast of Yorkshire, hurried to the spot. But he was defeated and killed at the Battle of Hastings (1066), after a valiant stand. Fair Edith of the Swan Neck was alone able to recognise the body of the last Saxon king. Saxon nationality fell with him. William divided the country between his followers, reserving for himself the best part, 1462 manors and the principal towns. Thus, men who on the continent had been valets or serfs, found themselves soldiers and gentlemen, possessing serfs and vassals, castles and seignoiries. The despoiled Saxon race long cursed their new masters, the French.

The French had, indeed, conquered the country; their civilisation, their customs, their language, their feudal institutions were to be implanted in England. Among the English nobility are still to be found French names, and the French language remained until the time of Edward III., that is to say, until the middle of the fourteenth century, the language of the court and tribunals.

But France paid dearly for this victory achieved by her arms, customs, and language. The dukes of Normandy, as kings of England, were possessed of power which long held that of the kings of France in check. Two centuries of war, eight of jealous enmity between the two peoples, such were the results for the French of that great achievement.

Conquest of Portugal by a French Prince (1094).—The infidels occupied Sicily and Jerusalem; they were still nearer and more threatening in Spain. The French knights lost no time in crossing the Pyrenees in order to assist the Christians of that country. In 1086, after the disastrous Battle of Zallaca, Alphonso VI. wrote to the King of France imploring his help. The indolent monarch did not answer this appeal to his honour; but a number of knights crossed the mountains and assisted the King of Castille to throw the Arabs back on Andalusia. Among these pious volunteers, arrived, towards the end of the eleventh century, two princes, Raymond, Count of Toulouse, and Henry, fourth son of the Capetian Duke of Burgundy. They both fought under the standard of Alphonso, King of Castille. They rendered him brilliant service, for Alphonso gave them his two daughters in marriage. With the hand of Thareja, Henry received a territory

which then extended from the Minho to the Mondego (1094). It was a small kingdom; he determined to enlarge it at the expense of the infidels and won over them seventeen victories, gloriously founding the independence of Portugal. His descendants reigned there until the twentieth century, but early forgot the origin of their nation. She, however, owes them a remembrance, for they carried her name with honour to the Far West. Others, at the same time, carried it to the heart of Asia.

CHAPTER XX

THE FIRST CRUSADE (1095–1099)

Peter the Hermit and the Council of Clermont (1095).—Alexus Comnenus, the Byzantine Emperor, threatened by the Seljukian Turks who were encamped before Constantinople, on the opposite bank of the Bosphorus, caused all Christian courts to re-echo with his cries of distress. But the dangers of this last broken remnant of the Roman Empire had no power to rouse the western Christians from their indifference. Already Silvester II., the first French pope, had written an eloquent letter to the princes in the name of forsaken Jerusalem in vain. Gregory VII., always inspired by great ideas, wished to place himself at the head of 50,000 knights to deliver the Holy Sepulchre. Emperors and popes alike failed to accomplish anything; a poor monk achieved the task which they had been unable to perform.

Jerusalem had fallen into the hands of a wild horde of Turks, and instead of the toleration which the pilgrims had received at the hands of the khalifs of Bagdad and Cairo, they were now overwhelmed with outrages, and it was only at great risk that any one approached the Holy Places. Peter the Hermit spread throughout France the sad story of these calamities, and the people, suddenly inspired with pious enthusiasm, armed on all sides in order to wrest the tomb of Christ from the hands of the infidels. The Council of Clermont assembled in 1095 and, presided over by a French pope, Urban II., preached the crusade. The number of those who, in that year and the following, assumed the cross of red linen, sign of their engagement in the holy enterprise, rose to over a million. The Church placed them under the protection of the Truce of God and granted many privileges for their property while the expedition lasted.

Departure of the First Crusaders (1096).—Men came from the

most remote countries: "Men were seen embarking at the French ports," said Gilbert of Nogent, "who, unable to make themselves understood, placed their fingers together in the shape of a cross to show that they wished to take part in the Holy War." The poor were the most impatient; trusting in God alone, they were the first to start without preparation, almost without arms, to the cry of *God wills it*. Women, children, and old men accompanied their husbands, fathers, and sons, and the little ones, placed on bullock carts, were heard to cry on seeing a castle or town, "Is not that Jerusalem?" An advance guard of 15,000 men, who, between them, had only eighteen horses, began the expedition under the command of Walter the Pennyless, a poor Norman knight. Peter the Hermit followed with 100,000 men. Another force brought up the rear led by the German priest, Gottschalck. They passed through Germany, slaughtering the Jews whom they met on their way, pillaging everywhere to secure food, and becoming accustomed to a life of licence. In Hungary the disturbances reached such a pitch that the population armed and hurled the crusaders into Thrace after having killed many of them. Only a small number reached Constantinople. The Emperor Alexis, to free himself of such auxiliaries, hastened their passage to Asia. They all fell under the sword of the Turks in the plain of Nicaea, and later their bones served to fortify the camp of the later crusaders.

Departure of the Great Army of Crusaders (1095).—While this foolhardy advance guard were meeting their death, the knights were arming, numbering themselves, and organising. They finally set out, 100,000 horsemen, it is said, and 600,000 infantry, by different routes and under different leaders. The northern French and the Lorrainers marched by way of Germany and Hungary. With them were Godfrey, Duke of Bouillon and of lower Lorraine, the bravest, strongest, and most pious of crusaders, and his two brothers, Eustace of Boulogne and Baldwin.

The southern French, under the rich and powerful Count of Toulouse, crossed the Alps and reached Thrace by way of Dalmatia and Slavonia; Adhemar, Bishop of Puy, adviser of the holy see and spiritual commander of the crusade, was in this army. The Duke of Normandy, the Counts of Blois, of Flanders, and of Vermandois joined the Normans of Italy, Bohemond, Prince of Tarantum, and his cousin Tancred, who was, after Godfrey, the most perfect knight of that time; together they traversed the Adriatic, Greece, and Macedonia.

The Crusaders at Constantinople (1097).—Constantinople was the general rendezvous. The emperor trembled lest the crusaders should wish to begin the crusade by taking possession of that great city. A few, indeed, thought of doing so in order to put an end to the perfidy "of these little Greeks, the most cowardly of mankind." But Godfrey of Bouillon opposed this idea. He even consented to pay homage beforehand to the Emperor Alexis for all the lands of which he took possession. "When he had done so, no one dared to refuse. As they took the oath, one of them, a count of high nobility, had the audacity to sit on the imperial throne. The emperor said nothing, knowing the presumption of the Franks; Count Baldwin, however, forced him to withdraw, telling him that it was not the custom to sit thus by the side of emperors. The other answered nothing, but glared angrily at the emperor, cursing and saying in his own tongue, "Behold that clown who is seated while so many brave captains remain standing." The emperor had these words explained to him, and when the counts had retired, took this haughty man apart and asked him who he was. "I am a Frank," said he, "and one of the noblest among them. In my town there stands at three cross roads an old church where any man who wishes to fight prays to God while waiting for his enemy. I have waited in vain, no one has dared to appear." The fears of Alexis were not removed until he had seen the last of these rough warriors cross to Asia.

Journey across Asia Minor: Battle of Dorylaeum (1097).—The first town which they reached was Nicaea; after two battles and thirty-five days of siege, they were about to take it, when they saw, flying from the walls, the Greek standard. To cross Asia Minor by the shortest route they became involved in the deserts which fill the centre of the peninsula and underwent terrible sufferings. The light Turkish cavalry of the Sultan of Iconium constantly hovered round them, cutting off the stragglers and the sick, and allowing none to disperse in search of food, forage, or water. When the sultan believed them to be weakened and discouraged, he came with an immense cavalry force to challenge them in the plain of Dorylaeum, in Phrygia, north-east of Iconium. The battle was for some time uncertain; the Turks had already inflicted many losses, when the arrival of Godfrey of Bouillon and a large force of knights put them to flight.

The Crusaders at Antioch (1098).—After fresh sufferings incurred in crossing the Taurus and in descending into Syria, they

arrived on October 18, 1097, before the great town of Antioch, which was defended by a lofty wall flanked with 450 towers and by a garrison of 20,000 men. The estimated number of the crusaders did not exceed 300,000. For seven months they remained before the place and would have waited there still longer had not Bohemond bribed an emir, who surrendered three towers to him. During a stormy night, when the noise of the wind and thunder deafened the sentinels, the Christians scaled the walls on rope ladders thrown to them from the place, and rushed into the city to the cries of *God wills it!* Ten thousand persons were slaughtered. Before allowing the Christian army to enter the town, the Norman required the other princes to agree that Antioch should be his portion of the booty. The crusaders made up for their long privations by indulging in excesses which decimated them, and they found themselves besieged in their own conquest by an innumerable multitude of Turks, commanded by Kerboga, lieutenant of the Khalif of Bagdad. Soon pestilence and famine raged in the city; many crusaders, despairing of ever reaching Jerusalem, left the army to return to Europe. Others remained, upheld by their courage; their faith saved them. Peter Bartholomew, a priest of Marseilles, declared to the commander-in-chief that St. Andrew had revealed to him, while asleep, that the lance which pierced the side of Christ was under the high altar of the church, and that it would give victory to the Christians. They dug and found the lance; the crusaders were filled with enthusiasm; they attacked Kerboga and cut his army to pieces.

Capture of Jerusalem (1099).—Instead of making their way at once to Jerusalem, they wasted another six months in Antioch, where they were consumed by plague. When at last they started, they were hardly 50,000 strong; a certain number, it is true, had remained in different towns through which the crusade had passed. They skirted the shores of the Mediterranean in order to keep in communication with the fleets of Genoa and Pisa, which supplied them with provisions. Enthusiasm increased as they drew near the Holy City and travelled through places consecrated by Gospel memories. At length, when they had climbed the last hill, their eyes beheld Jerusalem. "Oh, dear Jesus," said a monk who was in the army, "when the Christians saw the Holy City, how their eyes filled with tears! Loud cries of 'Jerusalem! Jerusalem! God wills it! God wills it!' rent the air. They spread out their arms, fell down on their knees, and kissed the ground."

It remained, however, to capture this city, the object of so many longings. It was defended by the soldiers of the Fatimite Khalif of Cairo, who had recently taken it from the Turks. This khalif, while the Christians were still at Antioch, had offered to allow them to enter Jerusalem but without arms. The offer had been contemptuously rejected; they intended that the Holy City should be their conquest and the price of their blood. They still suffered greatly under her walls. The sun of an Asiatic summer scorched the ground; the brook Cedron was dried up, the cisterns filled up or poisoned by the enemy; only a few pools of fetid water could be found, from which even the horses recoiled. To re-establish the *morale* of the army, a solemn procession passed round the town; on the Mount of Olives all the crusaders paused and prostrated themselves. On July 14, 1099, at daybreak, a general assault was made. Three great movable towers approached the walls; but after the first day's fighting nothing was accomplished. It was not until the next day that the crusaders finally captured the town. Tancred and Godfrey were the first to enter it. They were still obliged to fight in the streets and to force the Mosque of Omar, which was held by the Mussulmans. Rivers of blood flowed. "Beside the mosque," says a chronicler, "it reached the horses' bellies." When the fight was over, the chiefs and all the people laid down their arms, changed the clothes, washed their hands and naked feet, and singing hymns and sacred songs with ardent devotion, visited the Holy Places.

Foundation of a Latin Kingdom in Palestine (1099).—To keep their conquest it was necessary to organise it and to give it a chief. No king had taken part in the first crusade. Hugh of Vermandois, brother to the King of France, and Stephen of Blois, nephew to the King of England, had returned to Europe; Bohemond already had his principality of Antioch and Baldwin that of Edessa. The ambition of the Count of Toulouse was directed towards the throne of Jerusalem. Godfrey of Bouillon was preferred and was proclaimed king. He only consented, however, to take the title of *Defender and Baron of the Holy Sepulchre*, refusing "to wear a crown of gold where the King of Kings had worn a crown of thorns." The victory of Ascalon which he won shortly afterwards over an Egyptian army which advanced to recapture Jerusalem assured the conquest of the crusaders. Mussulman poets sighed: "How much blood has been shed! What disasters have visited the true believers! The women have been obliged to fly, hiding their faces. The

children have fallen under the sword of the victors! There is no other refuge for our fathers, formerly masters of Syria, than the backs of their swift camels and the entrails of vultures!" Islam, indeed, expiated her ancient conquests. But already the Christians wearied of so many hardships; almost all the lords were anxious to return to their own homes; hardly three hundred knights remained with Godfrey and Tancred. "Never forget," they always said with tears to those who went, "never forget your brothers whom you leave in exile." But the enthusiasm of Europe was chilled since from so vast an expedition so few had returned. Fifty years elapsed before a new crusade was undertaken for the relief of the Christians of Palestine.

Organisation of the Kingdom of Jerusalem: its Reverses.—Thus left to itself, this little kingdom was organised for defence and systematically regulated according to feudal principles which were transported bodily to Asia. The laws, language, and customs of France were preserved in the colony which she so boldly founded across the seas. Its code was the *Assizes of Jerusalem*, which Godfrey of Bouillon caused to be drawn up, and where a complete picture of the feudal regime can be found such as cannot be discovered in any other great legislative enactment. Fiefs were established; to the principalities of Edessa and Antioch were added the county of Tripoli and the marquisate of Tyre, the lordships of Nablous, Jaffa, Ramleh, and Tiberias; curious mixture of Biblical names and feudal institutions, which illustrates the real character of the Middle Ages—the intimate union between religious faith and military life.

The Part taken by France in the Crusades.—This great movement, which continued for more than a century and a half and which involved all the peoples of Europe, found its origin in France. "Men wept in Italy," says Voltaire; "they armed in France." And France was what the great English poet is compelled to call her, "the true soldier of God." Indeed, the French conducted the first crusade almost alone. They shared the second with the Germans (1147), the third with the English (1190), and the fourth with the Venetians (1203). The fifth (1217) and the sixth (1228) were of no importance. The seventh (1248) and the eighth (1270) were exclusively French. Moreover, the historian of the crusades gave to his book the title of *Gesta Dei per Francos*. Even to-day, in the East, all Christians, whatever tongue they may speak, have but one name, that of Franks.

General Results of the Crusades.—Thus, in the eleventh cen-

tury, the French began anew the Gallic invasions, crossed the Pyrenees, as did the Celtiberians of old; the Channel, as did the Belgians and the Kimri; the Alps, as did the Umbrians and the Insubres; and the Rhine, as did those Gauls who braved Alexander, threatened Delphi, and caused Asia to tremble. There was, indeed, at a distance of fifteen centuries, the same external impulse for expansion on all the frontiers. But if in both ages the same hardihood appears, the men of the later age had other ideas and attained to a far higher point of moral excellence. In England, in Naples, the French sought plunder only; but in Spain and in the East they fought and died for their faith. One of the grandest spectacles ever witnessed was this rush of millions of men to win a tomb. Very few returned; and those who succeeded these first pilgrims were able to follow their track by the bones with which the road was strewn. But civilisation is like a stronghold, the first who fall die nobly, and others cross the ditch filled with their corpses; only history collects the glorious names and consecrates their memory by associating with them that unknown crowd who thronged behind the chiefs.

The crusades did not attain their end. Jerusalem, delivered for a time, fell back into the hands of the infidels. But what changes took place in the very countries from which the crusades started and in the minds of those men and their contemporaries! Formerly they lived apart and as enemies; the crusades made an end of isolation and obliterated divisions. In this perilous journey across remote countries and amongst peoples of another creed, the crusaders acknowledged themselves brothers in Jesus Christ. In the division of the immense army into national bodies, men of the same country recognised each other as children of the same fatherland. The northern French drew nearer to the southern French; national brotherhood, lost since the days of Rome, scarcely realised for a moment under Charlemagne, was regained on the road to Jerusalem; and troubadours and trouvères began to sing, at least for the barons and knights, "the sweet country of France."

At Clermont, Urban II. had not preached the crusade merely for the deliverance of the Holy Sepulchre, but had in view also the removal of the scourge of private war. All Christendom paused in contemplation, "then there fell a great silence," said Gilbert of Nogent. A silence of arms and evil passions, which unfortunately did not last, yet gave some respite to the world and favoured the expansion of two new powers, the monarchy and the communes, both of which desired the public peace.

Effect on Commerce and Industry.—These great expeditions, which renewed the broken ties of Christian nations and joined Europe to Asia, also opened for commerce the roads which had been closed since the Saracen invasion. The Orient once more became accessible to the merchants of the West. Industry also awakened to furnish arms, harness, and necessary apparel to so many men; this movement, once begun, never died out. Mechanics and merchants multiplied. To protect their various industries they formed *corporations* of arts and crafts, and gradually vast sums of money accumulated in their hands. A new and hitherto unexpected source of influence was discovered during this period. The importance of personal property developed at the expense of that of real property, and by the labour of their hands and the exercise of their intelligence the bourgeoisie, masters of the world's gold, were enabled to take their place beside the nobles, the masters of the soil.

Creation of Military Orders: Arsenals.—The crusades were the cause of some new institutions. Gerard de Martigues, a Provençal, founded in 1100 the *military order of Hospitallers*, later known under the name of knights of Rhodes and knights of Malta. The *Order of the Templars*, instituted in 1118 by Francis Hugh de Payen, was an imitation of it. In the confusion caused by these great gatherings of men, signs of recognition were necessary. *Armorial bearings* were invented or multiplied. They were various emblems with which warriors of distinction decorated their shields, coats-of-arms, or banners, and which, from the thirteenth century, passed from father to son. These armorial bearings became a complicated language which formed the science of *heraldry*. Family names also began to be introduced about that period. Up to that time baptismal names were alone used, and as they were few in number, many individuals bore the same. Now the name of the estate was added in order to distinguish family from family. This name was hereditary and common to all members of one house, while the baptismal name was personal and died with the person who bore it.

Development of Knighthood: Laws of that Institution.—The nobles, already distinguished from the *manants* by these hereditary signs, wished to establish for themselves an organisation which would separate them still more from the people. They instituted the order of knighthood, a species of military brotherhood into which those of noble blood alone might enter after long tests. The *orders* of modern Europe are a last relic of them. "From the age of seven years, the future knight was taken away

from women and entrusted to some valiant baron who set him the example of knightly virtues. Until the age of fourteen, he accompanied the lord and lady of the manor as *page, varlet, damoiseau, or damoisel.* He wielded the lance and sword, hardened himself to the most violent exercise, and, by this incessant activity, prepared himself for the fatigues of war, and acquired the necessary physical strength to wear the heavy armour of the period. The example of a lord who was presented as a model of chivalry, the exploits of love and war which were described to him during long winter evenings in the hall, in which was hung the armour of knights and which was filled with memories of them; sometimes also the songs of a troubadour who paid for the hospitality of the lord by some poem in honour of the paladins of Charlemagne and Arthur—such was the moral and intellectual education which the young man received. It engraved on his mind a certain ideal of chivalry which some day he would seek to realise.

At fifteen he became a squire. There were *body squires* or *squires of honour,* who accompanied the lord and lady of the manor on horseback; *trencher squires,* who served at the lord's table; and *armed squires,* who bore their lord's lance and the various parts of his armour. The ideas of the period ennobled these menial offices. Only a noble might sample the seigniorial wine and food, or accompany the lady of the manor while passing through the forests. Religion and war, which had a dominant influence in the life of the Middle Ages, worked together to consecrate the initiation of the squire. He was led to the altar at the moment when he emerged from childhood into boyhood. His physical, military, and moral education was continued by violent exercise. Clothed in heavy armour, he cleared ditches and scaled walls; legends of knighthood developed more and more strongly in his mind this model of courage and virtue which poetry offered to his imagination under the names of Amadis, Roland, Oliver, and many other heroes. Added to this education, which developed the body and created a taste for heroic adventure, were the precepts of Christian religion, the salutary influence of which surrounded the future knight, instilling into him its principles. It will be understood then how holy and generous souls were formed, such as those of Godfrey of Bouillon and of Louis IX.

At the age of seventeen the squire often undertook distant expeditions. A ring hanging from an arm or leg announced that he had made a vow to accomplish some brilliant feat of valour

before receiving the honour of knighthood. At length, when he attained the age of twenty-one and seemed valiant and worthy to be dubbed a knight, he prepared for this initiation by symbolic ceremonies. The bath, sign of the purity of body and soul, the armed vigil, the confession, often made aloud, and the communion, preceded the reception of a new knight. Clothed in white linen, another symbol of moral purity, he was led to the altar by two of his elders, proved knights who were his sponsors-in-arms. A priest said mass and consecrated his sword. The lord who was to arm the new knight struck him with the flat of his sword, saying, "I dub thee knight in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." He caused him to swear that he would consecrate his arms to defend the weak and oppressed; he then gave him the accolade and girded on his sword. The sponsors-in-arms clothed the new knight in various pieces of armour, including a pair of gilded spurs, a distinctive sign of knightly dignity. The ceremony was often ended by a tournament. "Knighthood conferred privileges and imposed duties. Formed into a society and bound together by a common sentiment of honour and brotherhood, knights mutually defended each other. But if one of them was found wanting in loyalty or honour he was declared a *felon*, solemnly degraded and delivered up to capital punishment. Courtesy and respect for women were knightly virtues." Thus this society, though so violent, knew how to form for itself an ideal of perfection. Man during the Middle Ages had as his model in religious life his patron saint; in civil or political life, the knight.

CHAPTER XXI

LOUIS VI. THE FAT (1108–1137) AND THE COMMUNES

Extent of the Royal Demesne at the End of the Tenth Century.—The royal demesne had been greatly reduced since the time when Hugh Capet had united to it the whole duchy of France. Philip I. at the time of his death only possessed the counties of Paris, Melun, Orleans, and Sens; nor did he control the communications between these various towns.

Between Paris and Étampes lay the castle of the lord of Montlhéry; between Paris and Melun, the town of Corbeil, whose count hoped some day to found a fourth dynasty; and, lastly, between Paris and Orleans, the castle of Puiset, the capture of

which cost Louis VI. three years of war. Nearer still to Paris lived the lords of Montmorency and Dammartin; and in the east the Counts of Montfort, Meulan, and Mantes, all of whom plundered merchants and pilgrims despite royal safe-conducts. "My dear son," said Philip to Louis VI. one day, pointing out to him the castle of Montlhéry at the gates of Paris, "be careful to keep that tower which gave me so much trouble. I have grown old in fighting for it and attacking it." In the north the king still had, as Duke of France, powerful vassals in the Counts of Ponthieu (Montreuil and later Abbeville), Amiens, Soissons, Clermont in Beauvais, Valois and Vermandois, two fiefs then united in the hands of a brother of Philip I. South of the Loire the king had just bought the viscounty of Bourges, and the other lords, of Berry, the Prince of Deols (Chateauroux), and the Sieur of Bourbon (Moulins), paid him direct homage.

Great Vassals of the Crown and Ecclesiastical Feudalism.—Around the royal demesne stretched vast feudal principalities whose possessors rivalled the king in wealth and power. They were: in the north, the Count of Flanders; in the west, the Duke of Normandy and his refractory vassal the Duke of Brittany; in the south-west, the Count of Anjou, from whom the king received homage as Duke of France; in the east, the Count of Champagne; and in the south-east, the Duke of Burgundy. Further, beyond the Loire were the Duke of Aquitaine and Gascony and the Counts of Toulouse and Barcelona with their innumerable vassals, for each fief was in its turn divided in the same manner as the kingdom. The clergy themselves occupied an important place in the feudal hierarchy. Their chiefs were dukes, counts, and lords, possessing all the regalian rights exercised by the other suzerains, so that with the exception of five or six towns possessed by the king, the whole of France belonged to the lords, lay or ecclesiastical, great or small, dukes and counts, bishops and abbots, lords-banneret bearing the standard, and simple knights who only hoisted the pennant. But royalty, now so enfeebled, yet possessed traditions of power, justice, national unity, and public order; it had rights but lacked strength; it would, however, acquire this strength if it fell into the hands of a brave and energetic prince.

Activity of Louis VI.: Good Order in His Demesnes: He protects the Churches.—While the French nation, roused from a torpor which had lasted for two centuries, went forth from all its frontiers at once to conquer England, Naples, and Jerusalem, and to found a kingdom in Spain, the indolent Philip I. slumbered

on the throne. This inertia of the Capetians presently gave rise to anger. "It is the duty of kings," said Suger, "to curb with a powerful hand and by virtue of the original rights of their office the boldness of the nobles who rend the state by interminable wars, afflicting the poor and destroying the churches." In the opinion of the Church and in that of the people, monarchy was called upon to be a protector rather than a military power. Hugh Capet had understood this when, instead of the globe of Charlemagne, ambitious emblem of conquering dominion, he only added to the sceptre the hand of justice. But under his fourth successor it was not enough for the king to arm himself with a pacific symbol, as St. Louis did at the foot of the Oak of Vincennes; the hand of justice had then to be a mailed fist. Louis VI. was a king after Suger's heart. Always on horseback, lance in hand, he fought untiringly against the nobles who plundered travellers or pillaged the property of the Church, and succeeded in introducing a certain amount of order and security into his narrow demesne of the Ile de France. The Counts of Corbeille and Mantes, the lords of Montmorency, Puiset, Coucy, and Montfort were forced to respect the merchants and clergy. All the weak and the oppressed flocked round the protecting standard which he raised. The clergy placed their books at his service; "For," says Suger, "the glory of the Church of God lies in the union of the monarchy and the priesthood." Louis procured new allies by intervening in the municipal revolution of the lower classes.

Movement in the Urban and Rural Population.—Bishop Adelbero, in a Latin poem addressed to King Robert, only recognised two classes in society: the clergy who prayed, the nobles who fought; in a class far below them came the serfs and *manants* who laboured, but did not count in the state. These men, however, whom Bishop Adelbero did not count, alarmed him. He had a sorrowful presentiment of an approaching revolution. "Customs are changing," he cried, "the social order is shaken." Such is the complaint of the fortunate against every demand made by the poor. Adelbero's fear was justified. A revolution was beginning which was to deliver the *manants* from servitude to raise them to the level of those who were then masters of the country. But this revolution required seven hundred years to mature.

New Towns.—In the eighth century the serfs were not far enough removed from the old days of slavery to have won the right of living with their wives and children on the land which

they rendered fruitful by their toil. But two centuries later they were all settled in families ; their cottage and the adjoining ground had become an inheritance for them. The kindred spirit was followed by the spirit of association. When those dwelling-places of serfs were situated near a stream of water, a high road, fertile lands, or on the slope of a hill easy of defence, if the master was not too hard, they multiplied and became a village ; if they possessed enough strong arms and resources they would build a church there, and the bishop would form a new rural division, a parish. This parish only existed at first as an ecclesiastical division ; but the cure there held those records of public acts which, according to Roman law, were inscribed in the municipal registers in the towns. The Church was the first to organise rural communities ; a second step was made when the lord's steward, charged with maintaining the police of the village, and often a serf himself, selected some *vilains* to act with him as assessors. In a great many villages things remained at that point for a long time ; but those which grew into towns where there was industry, commerce, and wealth, the means, in fact, of resisting exactions, were inspired in the eleventh century by fresh ambitions and, as the lords had rendered the royal authority purely nominal, and as the vassals had often equally undermined that of their lords, so the serfs wished to extinguish the rights of their masters over their lands and persons.

Ancient Cities and Remains of Old Urban Institutions.—These ambitions did not appear only in the towns which had risen around abbeys and châteaux. The Roman Empire had also left a great number of cities in Gaul which were, in the midst of general confusion, the home of industry and commerce. Some of these, especially in the south, preserved their municipal organisation, their senate, and even enlarged the jurisdiction of their popularly elected magistrates. Others only preserved traces of this ancient organisation. But in all of them the memory of former liberty remained ; it awakened in them with force when, the multiplication of feudal families and the increasing luxury having augmented the number and claims of the lords, oppression reached its height.

Struggle in Various Places to secure Charters of Communes (1066).—As early as the year 997, during the reign of King Robert, the *vilains* of Normandy had attempted a general insurrection. " Why," said they, witnessing with simple eloquence to the equality of all men in strength and suffering :—

"'Pourquoi nous laisser faire dommage?
Nous sommes hommes comme ils sont;
Des membres avont comme ils ont;
Et de tout autant grands cœurs avons;
Et tout autant souffrir pouvons.'"[1]

They bound themselves together by oath and deputies from all districts united in a general assembly. But conspiracy was discovered, and its leaders, surprised by the Count of Evreux and his knights, were subjected to appalling tortures: some were roasted at a slow fire, some were sprinkled with molten lead, some were impaled, others were left with eyes gouged out or hands cut off or hamstrung, in order to spread terror in the countryside. In 1024 a revolt of the Breton peasants occurred. The conflict was sanguinary, many nobles perished; but the insurrection was drowned in the blood of the peasants. These cruelties seemed to succeed, and the lords, seeing the resignation of rural districts, thought they had seen the last of this temerity; the peasants alone, indeed, could do nothing. But after some years the movement began again, this time in the midst of the old cities and the new towns.

Some of them rebelled about the middle of the eleventh century in order to obtain the right of self-government by elected magistrates. Others, profiting by the need of the nobles who were anxious to go on the crusade, bought concessions; others again, who had preserved their local and elective administration since the time of the Romans, augmented their privileges. In short, for various causes, an eager desire for liberty disturbed all the towns in the north of France. Le Mans (1066), then Cambrai (1076), gave the signal, followed by Noyon, Beauvais, St. Quentin, Laon, Amiens, and Soissons, all of which extorted from their lords charters of communes. "Commune," said Gilbert of Nogent, who wrote in the twelfth century, "commune is a new name, and detestable. This is what one understands by that word: the taxable only render to their lords their just dues once a year. If they commit any crime they are free on paying a fine legally fixed." Thus the reign of law which the people (*manants*) had secured in place of arbitrary rule was the detestable thing which the old writer condemned. It was indeed the ruin of feudal society, because it was an endeavour to set a limit to violence. But the society which perishes through its own faults always attributes its downfall to that order by which it is replaced.

[1] From the *Roman de Rou*, by the Anglo-Norman poet, Robert Wace, Canon of Bayeux, who died in England 1184.

Intervention of the King in this Revolution.—This movement was general. It was felt throughout the whole of France, and though the citizens were in no sense united the cause was everywhere the same: the oppression of the lords. Louis VI., however, played a part in this revolution; in conflict with the same enemy, feudalism, he seconded by design this insurrection which assured to him allies in the very midst of the territories of those against whom he fought. He confirmed eight charters of communes, that is to say, he granted royal sanction and guarantee to the treaties for peace concluded between the rebel vassals and their lords, which established the concessions obtained by the people (*manants*). This clever policy at once gave immense power to the petty prince who held the title of King of France, for it recognised him as the patron of those who were later known as the third state. The devotion of the people towards the king which survived so long in France dated from that time. It is true that if Louis the Fat favoured the creation of communes on the lands of the lords, he did not allow the establishment of one in his own demesne, where he only granted letters of partial liberty. He wished to remain master at home, and some day to become master of his turbulent vassals.

History of the Commune of Laon (1066–1228).—The history of the commune of Laon is one of the many dramas of which the north of France was then the theatre. Laon at the end of the eleventh century was a rich and industrious city, whose bishop ruled as lord, but where, because of its very riches, the greatest disorder reigned. Nobles pillaged the burghers, the burghers pillaged the peasants when they came to market in the town, and the bishop always imposed the heaviest taxes. In 1106, a Norman called Gaudy, a passionate and arrogant man with habits more suited to a soldier than to an ecclesiastic, bought the bishopric. With such a lord, the miserable condition of the burghers of Laon grew worse and they began to seek means for remedying it. At that time there was much talk of the justice and order maintained in the commune of Noyon and of the good peace which reigned there. The establishment of a commune seemed to be the necessary remedy. The bishop was then in England. The burghers offered to his clergy and to the knights of the town a sum of money for authority to institute an elective magistracy. It was composed of a mayor and twelve sworn officials who had the right to summon the people by ringing a bell, to judge offences committed in the town and its outskirts, and to cause their judgments to be executed. The

bishop, on his return, sold his consent, then swore to respect the privileges of the new commune. The burghers, in order to secure all guarantees, bought that also of Louis VI.

But three years later, in 1112, the money given by the burghers had all been spent; the bishop repented of the concession which he had made. He invited the king to come to Laon for the festival of Easter, and promised to the prince, if he would withdraw his consent to the charter of commune, the sum of seven hundred livres of silver which he hoped to levy from his burghers when they had once more become taxable at discretion. This perjury excited great commotion in the town; the bishop took no notice of it and prepared the list of contributions; but on the fourth day there was a great clamour in the street and a crowd of people were heard shouting *Commune! Commune!* The house of the bishop was at once surrounded; the nobles who hurried to its defence were killed, and Gaudy himself, discovered in a cellar, was killed by the blow of an axe.

As always happens with a mob, it went too far. Instead of maintaining its rights without violence, it had shed blood, and the blood of a prince of the Church. The burghers were terrified at what they had done; to find protection against the anger of the king they begged Thomas de Marle, a neighbouring lord, to defend the town, offering him a sum of money. Thomas was not the man to fear war against the king, but he did not consider himself strong enough to defend a great town against him. He therefore advised the inhabitants to abandon their city and follow him to his castle of Coucy. Those who were most implicated accepted this offer. The remainder awaited the course of events. At first the peasants of the neighbourhood rushed upon the town to plunder it, and Thomas himself led his vassals to the pillage. Then the partisans of the bishop and all the nobles tracked the burghers wherever they could overtake them and avenged by further murders those which had already been committed.

Meanwhile, Thomas of Marle, excommunicated and pursued by a royal army, increased by a levy *en masse* of the peasants, was reduced to giving up the fugitives of Laon. Most of them were hanged, and their bodies remained without burial. Then the king entered the town and the commune was abolished. But sixteen years had not passed before the cause of the burghers and the ideas of liberty once more gained the ascendancy. The successor of Bishop Gaudy swore in 1128 to a new charter which the king again ratified.

Character and Consequences of the Communal Revolution.—This communal revolution was guilty of that excess often provoked by the treachery and violence of the opposite party. This is unfortunately true of every period. But it is impossible to help admiring in these *manants* of the eleventh and twelfth centuries the perseverance with which they struggled to escape feudal oppression, to substitute order for disorder, law for arbitrary rule, to obtain a good peace, to adopt the phrase of the last charter of Laon. Their efforts were defeated because they remained isolated, because each town only thought of its own liberty; and the monarchy which became all-powerful in the fourteenth century annulled the charters of communes. They had, however, been numerous enough to enable a new people to form itself under their protection; when the communes disappeared, the third state appeared, and the general liberties of the nation began at the moment when the local liberties of some towns ceased.

Increasing Power of the King.—"The king was seen," said Suger, "unceasingly riding with a few knights to introduce order as far as the frontiers of Berry, Auvergne, and Burgundy, from which it clearly appeared that the efficacy of royal virtue was not contained within the limits of any definite place." His soldiers, the knights, often deserted him or supported him half-heartedly. It was only with the help of the militia of the Church and of the communes that he captured and demolished the castle of Crecy, a haunt of brigands and the property of the Sieur Hugh de Puiset, "that ravening wolf who desolated all the district of Orleans. The siege of the château was protracted; on the knights refusing one day to go to the assault, a poor bald priest arrived with one of the communal forces of the neighbourhood and ran unarmed as far as the palisades; he tore up some of them, and calling his men to help, they effected a breach and entered the castle." Louis caused it to be razed to the ground and erected on the site of the cursed tower a public market. These efforts of Louis to protect the weak and to discipline feudal society were rewarded. In his war against Henry I., King of England, the communal militia grouped themselves round his oriflamme; and on the news of the projected attack by the emperor, a numerous army of burghers and vassals held themselves in readiness to defend him.

Conflict with Henry I., King of England.—In the war against Henry I., Louis proposed to secure Normandy for William Clito, nephew of the English king. It was an able project the

success of which would have removed an imminent peril from the French crown, united as England was to the duchy of Normandy; but Louis was defeated at Brenville (1119). Otherwise this check had no serious consequences, for the English king, fighting against his suzerain, dared not press the war to extremes, fearing that his example, the rebellion of a vassal against his lord, would induce his own vassals to act in the same way towards him; but the plan of Louis VI. failed; Clito did not secure Normandy.

Wreck of the "White Ship."—Some time after this a terrible misfortune befell King Henry. As he was embarking at Barfleur, according to Orderic Vitalis, a Norman called Thomas Fitz-Stephen came to him and, offering him a gold mark, said, "My father served your family at sea all his life; it was on his ship that your father was borne to England when he went to fight against Harold. My lord king, grant me in fief the same office. I have for your royal service a vessel thoroughly equipped, known as the *White Ship*." The king answered, "I have chosen the vessel on which I shall cross, but I willingly entrust to you my sons, William and Richard, and all their retinue." By order of the king nearly three hundred persons embarked on the *White Ship*. There were great barons, among them eighteen ladies of noble birth, daughters, sisters, nieces, or wives of kings and counts. All this brilliant youth prepared joyously for the voyage. They gave wine to the fifty oarsmen, and drove away with derision the priests who wished to bless the vessel. Meanwhile, night fell, but the moon illumined the still surface of the waters, the young princes begged Thomas, the captain, to urge on the oarsmen so that they might overtake the king's vessel which was already far ahead. The crew, excited by the wine, eagerly obeyed, and in order to take the shortest route, the captain coasted close by the Race of Catteville, which is bordered by rocks just below the surface of the water. The *White Ship* struck one of them violently, a gaping hole was made. A terrible cry arose from the whole crew; but the water gained. All became silent. Two men seized hold of the mainyard, Berold, a butcher of Rouen, and young Godfrey, son of Gilbert of the Eagle. They saw a man's head appearing in the water; it was Thomas, the pilot, who, after having plunged into the waves, came up again to the surface. "What has become of the king's son?" he asked them. "He has not reappeared, neither he nor his brother, nor any of the family," answered the two shipwrecked men. "Woe is me!"

cried Thomas, and he sank once more into the sea. Young Godfrey of the Eagle could not stand the cold of that freezing night of December; he loosed his hold of the yard, and allowed himself to sink to the bottom, after having commended his companion to God. Berold, the butcher, the poorest of the shipwrecked company, who was picked up the next morning by some fishermen, alone remained to recount the disaster. "Fatal disaster!" cried a poet of the age, "which plunges in the deep the flower of our nobility. Princes become the playthings of the waves. The purple and fine linen will rot in the watery depths, and the fishes will devour him who was born of the blood of kings!"

It was from a child that King Henry first heard the terrible news. At the first words he fell to the ground as if thunderstruck, and from that day he was never seen to smile.

Union of Normandy, England, and Anjou.—This misfortune was also fatal to France. Henry had now only a daughter, Matilda; he declared her his heir. Matilda was the widow of the Emperor Henry V.; in 1127 she married Geoffrey, Count of Anjou, surnamed Plantagenet, owing to his habit of placing a sprig of flowering broom in his cap in lieu of a feather. Until that time, the kings of France had been able to obtain the help of Anjou against Normandy. The marriage of Matilda put an end to this policy, and carried the Anglo-Norman dominion as far as the Loire. Another marriage, that of Matilda's son with Eleanor of Guienne, carried it as far as the Pyrenees.

Murder of the Count of Flanders (1127).—In the same year that Louis VI. saw the formation of that threatening union, another catastrophe held out to him the hope of compensation. Flanders at that period was already covered with industrial cities, and its citizens, numerous and proud, had little respect for the social distinctions which were powerful elsewhere. A great many serfs had slipped in among them and had acquired wealth and power. The revolution which has already been described as causing civil war in the north of France broke out of its own accord in the county of Flanders. In 1127, the chief of the province after the count was a serf, Bertholf, provost of the chapter-house of St. Donatien of Bruges. He had married his nephews and nieces into the oldest families of the country, and on one occasion he had no difficulty in securing the services of five hundred knights in a private war against a gentleman who was his enemy. Moreover, Count Charles the Good, a pious man and full of kindness to the poor, but also of the old school in the

opinion of Bishop Adelbero, caused inquiry to be made throughout his county to ascertain the positions of individuals and to bring back to servitude those who had not legally been freed from it. He even issued an edict which degraded free men who had married a woman descended from serfs ; a year and a day after his marriage he himself became a serf. The provost and all his people, directly threatened, plotted to assassinate the count, and one day murdered him as he was praying in the church of St. Donatien. This murder excited a great scandal. The body of the count was honoured as that of a saint ; the people of Gand, jealous of those of Bruges, appeared armed to recover his body. All the knights of the country prepared for war, for or against the traitors, who, besieged in the castle of Bruges, and afterwards in the very church where the murder had been committed, defended themselves with much bloodshed. King Louis, suzerain of the count, himself came with William Clito to attack them there and obliged them to surrender. The chiefs perished in terrible tortures ; the others, numbering one hundred and eleven, were hurled from the top of the tower of Bruges. Louis then invested Clito with the county of Flanders, in compensation for Normandy, which he had been unable to secure for him. But this was not the end of that bloody tragedy ; the relations and friends of the provost aroused Gand, Lille, Furnes, and Alost in rebellion against Clito, and appealed to Count Thierry of Alsace. Clito died in that war of a wound which he had received before Alost. The influence of Louis VI. in Flanders died out with him.

Influence of Louis VI. in the South.—Louis was more successful in the south, where he was able to exercise his influence and authority. The Bishop of Clermont, being at war with the Count of Auvergne, appealed for royal assistance and obtained it (1121). Again molested, he once more called upon the king, who this time crossed the Loire with a numerous army in which fought the Counts of Flanders, Brittany, and Anjou. He captured the castle of Montferrand, ordered one hand of all the prisoners to be cut off, and sent them back, each carrying in his remaining hand the one which had been amputated. The Duke of Aquitaine himself came to beg forgiveness for his vassal (1126). Two lords were contending for Bourbon ; Louis decided the question, but one of them refused to accept his decision ; he compelled him to do so by force of arms. Thus the king, having assumed the character during a period of trouble and violence "of a great judge to promote peace in the country," gradually found his

lost authority returning to him. It soon acquired greater strength than ever.

One of the last acts of Louis created a great stir and illustrated the novel character of royalty. Thomas of Marle had started his depredations anew. He confined in his prisons a number of merchants whom he had despoiled on the highway, in spite of their possession of safe-conducts from the king; in addition to this he wished to extract a ransom from them. He felt secure from interference behind the ramparts of his castle of Coucy, one of the strongest north of the Seine. The king led his troops to the foot of those walls believed to be impregnable. Thomas left the castle to lay an ambush, but was wounded, captured, and taken to Laon, where he died. His death was a deliverance to the whole country.

Three Popes in France.—The Investiture Controversy, that rivalry between the holy see and the empire which began under Gregory VII., had not yet come to an end, and the popes, driven from Rome by force of arms or the intrigues of the emperor, sought refuge and help in France. Gelasius II. died there. Calixtus II. was elected there, and to end this great discussion a council assembled at Reims in 1119 at which fifteen archbishops, over two hundred bishops, and an equal number of abbots were present. This assembly promulgated several canons against those guilty of simony and all those who exacted a fee for baptisms and funerals. Further, marriage of clerks was insisted upon; the Truce of God was again confirmed and the licentiousness of princes was condemned. Three years later the negotiations begun by Calixtus II. at Reims with the emperor ended in the Concordat of Worms, the first of those difficult treaties of peace which regulated the relations of the two powers, temporal and spiritual.

In 1130 a double election took place at Rome. Innocent II., forced to yield that town to his rival, took refuge in France. Louis the Fat assembled at Étampes a council which examined the claims of the two rivals, and at the proposal of St. Bernard declared in favour of Innocent II. In the following year, this pontiff held a fresh council at Reims, at which thirteen archbishops and two hundred and sixty-three bishops were present. There he anointed as king the young son of Louis the Fat. France thus became the asylum of popes and the scene of discussions on great ecclesiastical matters. Royalty could but gain by playing this rôle of the protector of popes.

Abelard.—At the time when the grave scandal of the conflict

between pope and emperor ended, the great quarrel began which divided the School during the whole of the Middle Ages, that of *realists* and *nominalists*, obscure but influential discussions which produced a revival of intellectual activity. William of Champeaux, son of a labourer of Brie, preached the realist doctrine with great brilliancy at the cloister school of Notre-Dame of Paris, and later at the abbey of St. Victor, which he founded in 1113 in the district which still bears that name. But he was eclipsed by one of his disciples, Abelard, a noble and handsome youth endowed with the power of fascination and with genius which prevented him from escaping popularity even when he retired into the desert. Alike in his teaching and in his writings, Abelard trenched at times upon the sphere of theology, which at that period invaded every branch of knowledge. St. Bernard, the greatest ecclesiastic of that period and one of the greatest teachers of all time, suspected a vein of heresy in the writings of this brilliant professor and denounced them. The Council of Soissons caused Abelard's book on the Trinity to be burnt (1122); and the Council of Sens again condemned it in 1140. Abelard died two years later, a monk at Cluny. His eloquence and his struggle against St. Bernard made him famous in his own day, his misfortunes and the love of Heloïse have rendered his name a popular memory to our own time.

CHAPTER XXII

LOUIS VII. THE YOUNG (1137–1180)

Louis VII. (1137–1180): His Marriage with Eleanor of Guienne.—Louis the Fat left six sons, of whom three entered the Church; of the others, one, Robert, was head of the house of Dreux, another, Peter, was head of that house of Courtenay which still exists in England. The eldest, Louis VII. the Young, had previous to the death of his father made a brilliant marriage. He married Eleanor of Guienne, heiress of Poitou and of the duchy of Aquitaine. It had become an established custom that women could inherit fiefs, could receive homage, judge their vassals, and lead them to war. This law, of which the house of France had no need to avail itself during three hundred and thirty years, and which it repudiated when the direct line of Hugh Capet became extinct, was one of the most active causes in effecting the ruin of feudal families which war constantly

decimated. The women carried the fiefs by marriage from house to house until most of them merged into that of France, which endured while the other houses became extinct. The dower of Eleanor was the richest which had yet been received by one of the French kings, being no less than one-half of southern France. Unfortunately Louis VII. did not retain it.

Continuation of the Policy of Louis the Fat (1137–1147).—Louis the Young continued the policy of his father. "The churches of Angoulême, Cluny, Clermont, Puy, and Vezelay having implored his protection," says Suger, "he allowed them to take refuge under his shield, to defend them he seized the rod of chastisement." A Count of Châlons and a Sieur of Montjai, among others, were deprived of their fiefs on account of their acts of violence. A war with the Count of Champagne must be traced to a different cause. The pope had nominated his own nephew to the Archbishopric of Bourges, disregarding the royal right of presentation. Louis drove the new prelate from his see, he found shelter with the Count of Champagne. The king had an old grievance against this lord. In an attempt which he had made to seize Toulouse the Count of Champagne had refused his feudal service. Louis the Young grasped the opportunity of humiliating this insubordinate vassal; he entered his lands with an army, ravaged them, and burned the little town of Vitry. Thirteen hundred people who had taken sanctuary in the church perished in the flames.

The Second Crusade (1147).—This was an all too common occurrence, but it weighed on the conscience of the king, and to expiate his crime Louis took the cross. His father owed his success partly to the fact that the richest of the lords had drained all their resources to go to Jerusalem and that many had never returned. Thus it was a mistake to give up this system. But no king had taken part in the first crusade; their reputation and their piety had suffered accordingly. The emperor, on this occasion, decided to go on the crusade; the King of France could not remain behind and abandon the kingdom which the Franks had founded on the banks of the Jordan, where civil discord and corruption had appeared and where the state was already tending to ruin under the combined weight of internal evils and external attacks. The Atabegs of Aleppo had captured Edessa, where they massacred all the Christian population, and Noureddin was threatening Palestine. Despite the prudent advice of Abbot Suger, Louis resolved to put himself at the head of a second expedition to the Holy Land. The crusade was

preached in France and in Germany by St. Bernard ; but enthusiasm had considerably declined. A general tax levied throughout the whole kingdom and over all grades of society, nobles, priests, or peasants, caused much discontent; at Sens the burghers killed the Abbot of St. Peter le Vif, lord of a part of their town, on account of an impost which he attempted to raise. "The king," said a contemporary, "started on his way in the midst of curses. St. Bernard was offered the command of the expedition ; he remembered Peter the Hermit and refused."

Louis, having taken the oriflamme at St. Denis, travelled through Metz and Germany towards Constantinople. Emperor Manuel sent envoys from a great distance to meet him. The French feudal lords resented the base flatteries of the Greeks, whom one of their number interrupted, saying, "Do not talk so much of the glory, the piety, and the wisdom of the king ; he knows it and we know it. Tell us briefly what you have to say." Manuel was alarmed ; what he desired was that the crusaders should swear to him an oath of fealty. They consented, as they had done at the time of the first crusade, but not without muttered threats. Already the Germans were in the midst of Asia Minor. But betrayed by their Greek guides they became entangled in the defiles of Mount Taurus and fell by the sword of the Turks. Conrad returned almost alone to Constantinople.

Louis, warned of the danger, advanced along the coast and secured his passage by the victory of Meander. But, in the neighbourhood of Laodicea, his army went inland to the mountains. The incompetency of its leaders and the indiscipline of the soldiers caused a preliminary disaster at the start. The king's life was in imminent danger ; for a long time he fought single-handed, all the nobles of his escort having been slain. "Noble flowers of France," says a chronicler, "who faded before having carried their fruits beneath the walls of Damascus." At Stalia it was found to be impossible to advance farther. The king and the nobles embarked on Greek ships to finish their pilgrimage by sea, abandoning the crowd of pilgrims, who perished beneath the arrows of the Turks, or who, accusing Christ of having deceived them, became Mussulmans. Three thousand thus escaped death.

Louis, having arrived at Antioch, thought no more of battles, but only of fulfilling his vow of pilgrimage, of praying at the Holy Sepulchre, and of ending as quickly as possible this unfortunate undertaking. Without attending to the request of the Prince of Antioch and the Count of Tripoli that he should remain

with them, he hastened his journey to Jerusalem. The people, the princes, and the prelates came out to meet him bearing olive branches and singing, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." It was necessary to act, and at least once to unsheathe the sword on holy ground. An attack on Damascus, one of the sacred towns of Islam and the pearl of the East, was suggested. Surrounded by immense gardens watered by the various branches of the Barradi and forming around it a forest of oranges, citrons, cedars, and trees laden with golden and luscious fruit, it was the capital of the desert and for Syria a bulwark or a perpetual menace, according to whether it was in the hands of friends or enemies. The attack seemed at first to succeed; the gardens were taken, but the Christian princes quarrelled over the skin of the bear before having killed it. The choice of the Count of Flanders as Prince of Damascus offended the others. They served with less zeal a cause become that of a single man, and allowed time for the Mussulman reinforcements to arrive, for the bear to show that he still had teeth and claws. They were obliged to raise the siege and return to Palestine. Again, few of those who had left Europe returned. The first crusade had at least attained its end, it had delivered Jerusalem; the second had uselessly shed Christian blood. By it Palestine was weakened, Islam was strengthened, and the crusaders brought back only shame from their enterprise, or, as in the case of Louis VII., dishonour.

Divorce of Louis VII. (1152): Vast Possessions of the King of England in France.—On his return, the king found his territory in a peaceful condition, thanks to the able administration of Suger. But he repudiated his wife Eleanor, who carried her duchy of Guienne to Henry Plantagenet, Count of Anjou, Duke of Normandy, and heir to the crown of England (1152). When, two years later, Henry entered into possession of his heritage, and when he added Brittany to it by the marriage of one of his sons with the only daughter of the count of that country, he became master of almost the whole of western France.

Diversions Favourable to Louis VII.—The King of France might well tremble for his crown. But Henry II., forced to respect him as his suzerain, if he would obtain a like respect from his vassals, hesitated to attack him. On one occasion he threatened Toulouse, but Louis hastened to the spot with a few knights and threw himself into the place. Henry at once retreated because the town was strong and thickly populated, but also to avoid a direct conflict with him whom feudal law

forbade him to fight. Louis also found means to defend himself by sustaining the continual revolts of the four sons of Henry II. against their father. The violence of the King of England gave him another ally, a saint. Some servants of this prince assassinated Thomas à Becket, the Archbishop of Canterbury, at the very foot of the altar. The dead bishop was more formidable than he had ever been during his lifetime. Louis demanded vengeance for the martyr from the pope; and to forestall excommunication, Henry submitted to all the humiliations which were imposed upon him. He spent his last days fighting against his subjects, his sons, and the King of France.

Administration of Louis VII.: Suger.—Louis VII. was rather a monk on the throne than an active and resolute monarch. However, he still seconded the communal movement. Twenty-five charters are signed with his name. But like his father, he would not grant them on his own territory. At Orleans a rising of burghers was harshly put down. At times he even helped the lords to act in their demesnes as he did in his; thus Abbot Pons, at the word of the king, overthrew the commune of Vezelai, the dramatic history of which is still on record. The policy which Louis favoured helped the progress of urban population. Under him, said a chronicler, many towns were built and many of the old ones were enlarged. Forests were cut down and vast spaces cleared. He confirmed the ancient privileges of the Hansa, or the society of the merchants of Paris; and Pope Alexander III. laid in 1163 the foundation stone of the cathedral of that town, the church of Notre-Dame. Louis VII. in his lifetime caused his son, Philip Augustus, to be crowned, and attached the privilege of coronation to the cathedral of Reims. The peers were seated at the ceremony.

Suger, born of humble parents in the neighbourhood of St. Omer, was brought up by the monks of St. Denis. He deserved, by his common sense, by his mental activity, and by his devotion to the interests of the king and the kingdom, the friendship of Louis VI., who had been a fellow-pupil with him at the abbey, and the confidence of Louis VII. Elected by the monks to the abbey of St. Denis while he was travelling to Rome, he renounced the pomp with which prelates surrounded themselves and devoted all his resources to decorating the interior of the church and to rebuilding the towers and gateway constructed by Dagobert. Louis VII. named him as regent during the crusade; Suger showed the same modesty and ability which introduced order into the finances of the king and secured peace in the kingdom.

It is true that the departure of so many turbulent lords rendered the task an easy one; and if the name of Suger is placed among those of the three or four great ministers whose memory is honoured in France, it must be recognised that his services cannot be compared with those of Sully, Richelieu, and Colbert. But he had in common with them a perception of the duties of monarchy and the need of order. His words to Louis VI. have been recorded above; in a letter to Louis VII., urging him to return from the crusade, he adjured him by his coronation oath "not to abandon the flock too long to the fury of the wolves."

During the reign of Louis the Young, the building of the existing cathedral of Tours was begun. It had already been burnt down twice, in 561 and 1166. Archbishop Joscion laid its foundation stone in 1170, but it was not completed until 1547; Henry IV. called its twin towers "beautiful jewels which only lacked a setting." It is needless to add that in that monument which was four centuries in the building all styles appear, from the Roman, at the foot of the towers, to the Renaissance, which crowns the summit.

SIXTH PERIOD—THE FIRST VICTORY OF THE MONARCHY OVER THE FEUDAL ARISTOCRACY

(1180–1328)

CHAPTER XXIII

PHILIP AUGUSTUS AND LOUIS VIII. (1180–1226)

Character of this Period.—From the ninth to the twelfth century there was indeed a king, but monarchy in the true sense did not exist, since that central power which should have remained in the hands of the crown had become localised and was exercised by all the great landowners. The revolution which had destroyed the unity of the country for three centuries was succeeded by another which strove to reunite the scattered members of French society and to deprive the lords of rights which they had usurped in order to restore them to the crown, thus rendering the king the sole judge, administrator, and legislator of the country. This change began in the reigns of Philip Augustus and St. Louis who revived a central government; but was not completed until the age of Louis XIV., owing to various incidents—the Hundred Years' War in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the Wars of Religion in the sixteenth—which delayed this great internal work.

Philip Augustus (1180–1223): Acquisition of Several Provinces. — Philip II. surnamed Augustus, owing to his birth occurring in the month of August, ascended the throne at the age of fifteen. His relatives and vassals expected to obtain an easy advantage over a child; but instead of that, he imposed on them by his activity and determination. As a result of the wars which he was obliged to maintain, he acquired in 1185 the counties of Amiens, Vermandois, and Valois. Artois, which he had inherited from his wife in 1191, carried the immediate dominion of the crown to the frontiers of Flanders. The Duke of Burgundy, the Sieur of Beaujeu, and the Count of Châlons, who pillaged churches, were forced to respect them. He banished the Jews, appropriating their lands and houses (1182), and caused a number of *paterins* or heretics to be burned. Lastly,

the royal forces united with the commons put down with extreme severity an insurrection of *cottereux*, bands of brigands who ravaged the centre of France.

Third Crusade (1190–1191).—Philip, like his father, undertook a crusade. His object was to recover Jerusalem, which in 1187 had fallen into the hands of the infidels. Eight kings, all of them French, had reigned there since the time of Godfrey of Bouillon. The last, Guy of Lusignan, had just been taken prisoner by Saladin at the Battle of Tiberius. Christendom made a great effort; Richard Cœur de Lion, King of England, and Philip Augustus set out together. Emperor Frederic Barbarossa had preceded them. The recapture of Acre, however, marked the limit of their success.

Rivalry between Philip Augustus and Richard.—During the protracted siege of that town the misunderstanding between the two kings came to a head. Eclipsed by his brilliant rival, Philip hastened back to France in order to plan the overthrow of the too powerful house of England. He allied himself with John Lackland, Richard's brother, whom that king had left behind him; the two allies hoped to divide the spoils between them. But Richard, escaped from the prison where he had been dishonourably confined by the emperor, determined to avenge himself on his brother and his rival. The former won his pardon by murdering a French garrison which he had introduced into a castle; Philip Augustus accepted war, which began with violence in Normandy. Richard, troubadour and king, fought and sang together. He defeated Philip near Gisors, but without reaping much benefit from his victory. Pope Innocent II. interposed and compelled them to sign a truce of five years (January, 1199). Two months later Richard was killed by an arrow during the siege of Chalus in Limousin, from whence he wished to carry away a treasure which the lord of that castle had found.

Condemnation of John Lackland: Acquisition of Several Provinces (1204).—The brother of Cœur de Lion succeeded him (1199). The King of France at once became the enemy of his former ally and supported in opposition to him a pretender, young Arthur, son of an elder brother of John Lackland. Arthur was taken prisoner by his uncle and died shortly afterwards. The English king was accused as a murderer and Philip cited him to appear before the twelve great vassals of the crown or peers of the realm. On his refusal, Philip confiscated his fiefs and with an army entered Normandy. John did not defend the province, and the French took Gaillard, a stronghold built by Richard,

which resisted for six months. Pope Innocent III. attempted to impose peace on the two kings; Philip was gaining too much in this war against a faint-hearted enemy to put an end to it; he sent a proud reply to the pontiff and, vigorously following up his success, seized all the towns of the province, including Rouen, "the wealthy city, filled with noblemen and chiefs of the whole of Normandy." Anjou, Touraine, and Poitou were also easily annexed to the royal demesne. These were the most brilliant conquests that a king of France had yet effected (1203–1204).

Victory of Bouvines (1214).—Coward though he was, John could not resign himself to so much shame. He formed a vast coalition. While he in person was to attack France from the south-west, the Emperor Otto IV., the Counts of Flanders and Boulogne with all the princes of the Netherlands were to attack it from the north. But France roused herself to repel this foreign invasion. Philip's son, Louis, made progress against the English king in Poitou; and Philip with the remainder of the knights and the militia of the northern communes marched against the enemy whom he met at the bridge of Bouvines on the Marq, between Lille and Tournay (July 27). The chief leaders of the enemy, surrounded by forces estimated at 100,000 men, were so sure of victory that they divided the country between them beforehand.

The peril in which the King of France stood explains a fact which history has strangely distorted. Philip Augustus was represented as placing his crown upon the altar and saying, "It is for the most worthy." This dramatic story cannot be believed, but more credit may be placed upon the following narrative of an ancient chronicler: "The king," he says, "demanded a mass; when it had been said he caused bread and wine to be brought, then had some slices cut and ate one, after which he said to those around him, 'I beg all my true friends to eat with me in memory of the twelve apostles who, with our Lord, drank and ate, and if there is any one who thinks evil or treason, let him not draw near.' Then advanced Sieur Enguerrand of Coucy who took the first piece, and Count Walter of St. Pol next, saying to the king, 'Sire, it will be seen to-day whether I am a traitor.' He spoke these words because he knew that the king held him in suspicion on account of disquieting rumours. The Count of Sancerre took the third slice and the other barons followed; and there was so great a crowd that they could not all reach the sideboard which held the pieces of bread. When the king saw this, he was exceeding glad, and said to the barons, 'Lords,

you are all my men and I am your king, such as I am, and I have loved you greatly. . . . In the name of this I pray you to preserve to-day my honour and your own. And if you consider that the crown would be better worn by one of you than by me, I will withdraw willingly and with all my heart.' When the barons heard him speak thus they began to weep, saying, 'Sire, in the name of God, we thank you ! We would have no king but you. Moreover, ride boldly against your enemies for we are prepared to die with you.' "

The two armies remained for some time at a short distance from one another, neither daring to start the action, and the French retired by the bridge of Bouvines to march on Hainault, when the enemy, attacking the rear-guard, forced them to turn.

"Philip," said his chaplain, William the Breton, "was resting that moment under a tree, near a chapel, with his armour unbuckled ; at the first sound of fighting he entered the church to utter a short prayer, promptly armed himself, and sprang on his charger with as great a joy as if he had been going to a wedding or a banquet. Then shouts were heard along the field: 'To arms, warriors, to arms!' and the trumpets rang out. The king was in the forefront, without waiting for his banner, the oriflamme of St. Denis, woven of bright red silk, which was carried that day by a most valiant man, Galon de Montigni. Guérin, the bishop elect of Senlis, ordered the battle so that the French had the sun at their backs, while it shone in the eyes of the enemy. Three hundred burghers of Soissons, vassals of the Abbot of St. Medard, who served on horseback, opened the action on the right, boldly charging the knights of Flanders, who hesitated for some time to enter into conflict with common men. But the cry of *Death to the French!* uttered by one of their number, excited them, and the Burgundians, led by their duke, having come to reinforce the men of Soissons, the mêlée became furious. Count Ferrand fought on that side."

When the action began, the militia of the communes were already beyond Bouvines ; they recrossed the bridge in all haste, ran to the side of the royal ensign, and placed themselves in the centre, before the king and his battle array. The German knights, with Emperor Otto in their midst, charged these brave men and forced their way through them to penetrate to the king ; but the most renowned of the French warriors threw themselves in their path and checked them. During this conflict, the German infantry passed behind the cavalry and arrived at the place where Philip was fighting. They dragged him from his horse

and, when he was overthrown, tried to stab him through the visor of his helmet or some flaw in his armour. Montigni, who carried the standard of France, held up and waved his banner to summon help; a few knights and men of the communes rushed to the spot. They rescued the king, set him once more on his charger, and he again flung himself into the fray. The emperor, in his turn, was almost taken. William des Barres, the bravest and strongest knight in the whole army, successful adversary of Richard Cœur de Lion whom he had twice dismounted, already held Otto by his helm and was striking him violently when a crowd of enemies hurled themselves upon him. Unable to loosen his hold or to reach him, they killed his horse in order to throw him to the ground; but he extricated himself at once; alone and on foot, like a furious lion, he made a wide space around him with the help of his sword and dagger. Otto, at least, was able to escape.

On the right, Ferrand, Count of Flanders, had fallen wounded into the hands of the French; in the centre, the emperor fled with his German princes. But on the left, Reynold of Boulogne and the English held their ground. They had overcome the people of Dreux, Perche, Ponthieu, and Vimeu. "At that sight," said the poet chronicler, "Philip of Dreux, Bishop of Beauvais, was stricken with grief, and holding by chance a club in his hand, he forgot his calling and struck down the chief of the English and with him many others, breaking their limbs but shedding no blood, and bidding those round him to say that it was they who had done this great slaughter, fearing that he would be accused of having violated the canons and committed a deed unlawful to priests. The English were soon completely routed, with the exception of Reynold of Boulogne, who had placed a body of squires on foot in a double circle bristling with long pikes. He sprang from among them as if out of a fort in which he had been sheltering to take breath. In the end his horse was wounded, he himself fell and was captured. Five other counts and twenty-five knights-banneret had already been taken."

The return of the king to Paris was a triumphal progress; everywhere on his road the churchs rang with thanksgivings and the sweet hymns of the clergy mingled with the noise of bells and the harmonious notes of warlike music. The houses were hung with curtains and tapestries, the roads strewn with green boughs and fresh flowers. All the people, men, women, children, and old people, hastened to the cross-roads; all wished to see the Count

of Flanders, who, wounded and chained, lay in a litter; they said to him, "Ferrand, there you are now bound and in irons; you will never again have the power to rouse yourself and attack your master." At Paris the burghers, a crowd of clergy, scholars, and people went to meet the king, singing hymns and chants. Their festivities were unequalled; the day did not suffice them, and they feasted in the evening with many lights so that the night seemed as bright as the day. The scholars maintained the festival for a whole week. During these rejoicings the communal militia, which had conducted itself so valiantly in the battle, came in pomp to entrust its prisoners to the provost of Paris. One hundred and ten knights had fallen into its hands, not to mention the common soldiers. The king allowed some to be retained as hostages, the remainder he confined in the great and the small Chatelet of Paris. Ferrand was detained in the new tower of the Louvre, where he remained for thirteen years (1214). The abbey of *Victory* was built near Senlis; its ruins are still in existence.

Philip does not seem to have won from this great success all the advantages which it offered. He acquired no new territory; Flanders remained in the possession of the wife of Ferrand, the county of Boulogne in that of the daughter of Reynold, and John of England bought a truce which left him Saintonge and Guienne. But Philip had repelled a formidable invasion, caused an emperor and a king to fly before him, baffled the evil designs of several great vassals, and, lastly, given to the Capetian dynasty the baptism of glory which it had lacked till then, and revealed France to herself. This triumph gave rise to something hitherto unknown, the national spirit, patriotism; a feeble spirit still, despite the burst of rejoicings, and a spirit which seemed more than once to be extinguished, only to appear again with victorious energy. France had become a nation and had acquired a king.

Warlike Activity of the Nobility.—The nobility signalised its warlike activity during this reign by two great enterprises: the fourth crusade, which changed the Greek empire into a Frank empire, and the war against the Albigenses which annexed to France the refractory peoples of the south. Philip took part in neither expedition. He left the nobles to exhaust their resources and their turbulence in these wars which were doubly profitable to France, both by the order which they allowed to be established in the kingdom and by the glory which they shed on its name in distant lands. "I have at my side," he wrote to the pope, who

pressed him to engage in the holy war against the Albigenses, "two great and terrible lions, the Emperor Otto and King John; thus I am unable to leave France."

Fourth Crusade (1202–1204).—The fourth crusade, in which Villehardouin, the seneschal of the county of Champagne, took part and of which he recounted the history, was a special enterprise. Since the failure of the third crusade, Jerusalem had been forgotten, and instead of pious expeditions, the Christian world had been the scene only of wars between kings and peoples. England, Germany, and France, formerly united to deliver the Holy Sepulchre, armed themselves against each other. Emperor Otto IV. was excommunicated, Philip Augustus had been, John was to be, and these three excommunicates thought little of the Holy Land. The great Pope Innocent III. attempted to recall it to their minds. He caused a crusade to be proclaimed, promising the remission of their sins to those who served God for a year. Fulk, vicar of Neuilly-sur-Marne, preached the holy war. He went to a tournament which was being held at Champagne, and by his burning words persuaded all the princes and knights who were present to take the Cross. On this occasion the kings and the people alike held aloof. The crusaders resolved to travel by sea and sent a deputation to Venice in order to hire ships (1201). The republic demanded 85,000 silver marks and half the conquests which the expedition might make. As they could not pay so large a sum, Venice allowed them time on condition that they would help the republic to take Zara in Dalmatia. They consented and gave them besides Trieste and Istria (1202). The preliminary account thus settled, they were able to start, but were uncertain as to where they should go. The failure of the two last crusades showed them that it was necessary to have a base if they were to operate with any degree of success in Palestine, and this base could only be Egypt or the Greek Empire. The Venetians persuaded their allies that the keys of Jerusalem were at Cairo or Constantinople. There was some truth in this view, but it was primarily the outcome of commercial considerations. The possession of Cairo would open up the road to India to the merchants of Venice, that of Constantinople would secure for them the commerce of the Black Sea and the whole of the archipelago. They decided for Constantinople, to which Alexius, a young Greek prince, offered to guide them on condition that they would restore his father, Isaac Angelus Comnenus, who had been deposed, to the throne (1203).

When the French arrived at Constantinople, saw its high walls, its innumerable churches, the gilded domes of which glittered in the sun ; when they had cast their eyes, said Villehardouin, " far and wide over this town which was queen of all others, the boldest among them trembled, and each man looked at his arms, of which he would soon have need." On the shore a magnificent army of 60,000 men was lined up. The crusaders expected a terrible battle. All the warriors were rowed to the shore in boats. Even before their boats grounded " the knights, all armed, leapt into the sea waist deep, in battle array, sword in hand, with the brave archers, the sergeants, and the crossbowmen. And the Greeks made a great show of checking them. But when it came to lowered lances, the Greeks turned their backs, fleeing and leaving the shore in their possession. And true it is that no battlefield was ever more boldly won." On July 18, the town was carried by assault and the old emperor, drawn from his dungeon, was restored to his throne. Alexius had made the most dazzling promises to the crusaders ; in order to keep them he imposed new taxes and so exasperated that feeble people that they strangled their emperor, created another, Murtzuplous, and closed the gates of the town. The crusaders at once attacked it. A whole quarter, a square league in extent, was burnt. How many masterpieces perished then!

Foundation of a Frank Empire at Constantinople (1204–1261).— Constantinople taken, they divided the empire between them. Baldwin IV., Count of Flanders, was elected emperor. Boniface, Marquis of Montferrat, was elected King of Macedonia. Villehardouin, Marshal of Roumania, and his nephew Prince of Achaia. There were dukes of Athens and Naxos, a count of Cephalonia, lords of Thebes and of Corinth. Venice kept a quarter of Constantinople, with all the ports of the empire and all the islands. It was a new France which rose, with its feudal customs, at the extremity of Europe. But these crusaders were not numerous enough to retain their conquest for any length of time. By 1261 the Latin empire crumbled to ruins. But until the end of the Middle Ages, and the conquest by the Turks, there still survived in various parts of Greece some of those feudal principalities so strongly established by the French of the thirteenth century in the land of Miltiades and Leonidas.

Crusade against the Albigenses (1208).—The crusade against the Albigenses was more directly profitable than that of Constantinople. The south of France had long been separated from the

north. The attempts to establish her independence in the time of Dagobert, Charles Martel, Pippin, Charlemagne, Charles the Bald, and Hugh Capet have been seen. It had a distinct language and peculiar customs. Commerce had brought comfort to the burghers and luxury to the barons; both exercising municipal functions in common without jealousy or hatred gave peace to the country. But in these rich cities, in these brilliant courts, enlivened by the songs of troubadours, religious doctrines were as lightly regarded as morals. Heresy penetrated everywhere. Pope Innocent III. organised against it the Inquisition, a tribunal charged with seeking out and judging heretics with the assistance of tortures, which burned innumerable victims without succeeding in stamping out heresy, because butchery is a poor means of securing the triumph of truth. The Inquisition having thus failed, the pope caused a crusade to be preached. The knights of the north of France, coarse and barbarous in comparison with those of the south, seized the occasion to avenge themselves of this odious superiority. They enrolled themselves in crowds in the hope of pillaging the rich cities of which they had heard such wonders. Simon de Montfort, a count in the neighbourhood of Paris, was their chief. The war was carried on without pity. At Beziers, 15,000 persons were slain, and the slaughter was committed everywhere else on the same scale. The powerful Count of Toulouse, the Viscounts of Narbonne and Beziers were despoiled (1209); the King of Aragon, who came to their help, was killed in the Battle of Muret (1213). The legate of the holy see offered the fiefs of the fallen to the powerful barons who had made this crusade. But they refused to accept that blood-stained property, and the legate presented it to Simon de Montfort and declared that the widows of heretics possessing noble fiefs might only marry "Frenchmen," the orthodox barons of the north, during the next ten years. The civilisation of the south perished, crushed by these rough hands. "The joyous science," as poetry was described by the troubadours, could no more be sung amid bloody ruins.

In their misery, the people of the *langue d'oc* remembered the King of France. Montpellier placed itself in his hands and Philip sent his son Louis to show them the banner of France. Louis returned a second time after the death of Simon de Montfort, who was killed before Toulouse; Amaury de Montfort, the son of the count, offered to cede to the king the conquests of his father which he could no longer defend in face of the universal

reprobation of his subjects. Philip, then on the brink of the grave, rejected this offer, which was accepted five years later.

English Expedition (1216).—On returning vanquished and humiliated to his island after the Battle of Bouvines, John found his barons in a state of rebellion. The whole of England was under arms; nobles, burghers, clergy, and laymen, exhibiting to feudal Europe a notable example of unity, forced the king to sign the great charter of English liberties (1215). John appealed to Pope Innocent III. who, on his own authority, declared the great charter to be invalid and released the king from his oath. John at once went to war against his barons, who called to their help the son of Philip Augustus, Louis, the husband of John's niece, Blanche of Castille. Innocent III. threatened Philip Augustus with excommunication, and the king pretended to attempt to check his son. But Louis answered, "Sire, I am your liege man for the territory which you gave me in France, but it is not for you to decide the fate of the kingdom of England." Accordingly, Louis persevered in his enterprise and, on May 30, 1216, landed in England, despite a papal excommunication. This sentence, which was becoming ineffective by dint of repetition, would not have prevented the French prince from succeeding had not the death of King John occurred. The latter left as his successor a child, Henry III. The barons realised that their cause would be better advanced by this child king than by a foreign prince who, after his victory, would doubtless be little disposed to respect their privileges, and who could, in time of need, be assisted by the forces of France. Louis was thus gradually abandoned and compelled to return to France in 1217.

Internal Administration.—Philip Augustus reigned with glory for forty-three years. The royal demesne was doubled by the acquisition of Vermandois, Amienois, Artois, Normandy, Maine, Anjou, Touraine, Poitou, and a part of Auvergne. The seventy-three *provostships* of which it was composed in 1223 were placed under the guardianship of *bailifs;* feudalism was attacked in one of its most ruinous privileges, the right of private war, by the establishment of the *quarantaine le roi*, an interval of forty days which must elapse between the suffering of an injury and the taking of private vengeance. Paris was beautified, paved, surrounded by walls, endowed with guildhalls, and superintended by a more efficient police; the Louvre was begun, the University of Paris established with great privileges, and the public records inaugurated. The authority of the court of peers was consecrated by a memorable example, the condemnation

of the King of England, and finally, monarchy became once more a legislative power and ordinances again became applicable to the whole state, a character which they had not possessed since the last capitulation of Charles the Simple. Such were the deeds of Philip Augustus. He had brought the monarchy beyond tutelage, to the great advantage of order, industry, and commerce which he encouraged, to the great profit both of the crown and of the people.

Relations between Philip and the Court of Rome.—But Philip underwent the censure of Rome. He married a second time Ingeburga of Denmark (1193), but on the day after the wedding he renounced her. A council of bishops pronounced the invalidity of this union, and Philip at once married Agnes of Meran, thereby causing a great scandal. A man, because he was king, trifled with the honour of a woman, a poor, defenceless stranger. Philip thought the sentence of the bishops would put an end to any discussion. But Ingeburga appealed to the pope, and Innocent III., in the name of outraged morals and religion, took up the cause of the woman whom all others had forsaken. Philip resisted. The pope cast an interdict over his kingdom. Everywhere services were stopped ; the people died without prayers or consolations. In vain the king deprived those bishops who observed the interdict of their sees. He was obliged to bend before the universal discontent which threatened his crown ; he put away Agnes of Meran, who died of grief, and took to him again Ingeburga in 1213. One of those great examples which Christianity alone has presented to mankind was thus afforded to the world.

Philip yielded and wisely ; in another instance he resisted, wisely also. This was in 1203. He took possession of the fiefs which John had lost by his felony. Innocent III. threatened him with the anathema of the Church if he went further. Philip secured the co-operation of his great vassals and obtained from them a written promise to support him in this cause for all and against all, even against the lord pope. He then continued his enterprise.

On these two occasions the pope and the king in turn had appealed to public opinion with good reason ; the former by interesting the people in the cause of morality, the latter by interesting the barons in the legitimate prerogatives of the crown. It was an advance indicating that France was emerging from the period when force reigned supreme.

In 1184, Philip Augustus caused the cathedral of Sens to be

rebuilt. The north tower still bears features of twelfth-century architecture. The second tower, begun in 1267, was not finished until 1535.

Louis VIII. (1223–1226): The South of France brought under the Authority of the King.—Philip Augustus died at Mantes on July 14, 1223, at the age of fifty-nine. The reign of his son was merely a continuation of his own. Louis VIII. had, one day during his father's lifetime, been proclaimed king in London by the English barons who were in revolt, and twice he crusaded against the Albigenses. On ascending the throne of France, he continued these two wars. From the English he conquered that part of Poitou which Philip Augustus had not permanently acquired, Aunis, Rochelle, Limoges, and Perigeux. In the *langue d'oc* he took Avignon. The country from the Rhône to within four leagues of Toulouse was subject to him ; and he placed two seneschals or bailiffs at Beaucaire, Carcassonne, and Beziers. Thus, the whole of the south, west of the Rhône, with the exception of Guienne and Toulouse, recognised the royal authority. There were no longer two Frances ; the work of territorial unity was progressing.

Louis VIII. died on his return from his southern expedition at the castle of Montpensier in Auvergne. He was thirty-nine years of age. He left in his will a hundred sous to each of the two thousand leper hospitals in France and twenty thousand pounds to two hundred town hospitals. He had, in 1224, liberated all the serfs in the fief of Étampes. These liberations increased until the time of Louis X., who declared that there should no longer be any serfs in France.

CHAPTER XXIV

ST. LOUIS (1226–1270)

St. Louis.—St. Louis was the true hero of the Middle Ages, a prince as pious as he was brave, who loved feudalism and who dealt it many wise blows ; who reverenced the Church, and who could, when necessary, resist its head ; who respected all rights, but above all followed the course of justice ; who had a frank and gentle spirit, a loving heart filled with Christian charity, and condemned to torture the body of the sinner in order to save his soul ; who, living on earth, yet gazed ever heavenward, and who rendered his kingly office a magistracy of order and

equity. He was canonised by Rome and the people still picture him seated beneath the oak of Vincennes dispensing justice to all comers. This saint, this man of peace, did more, in the simplicity of his heart, for the progress of monarchy than the most subtle councillors or ten warrior kings, because, after his reign, the king appeared to the people as the incarnation of order and justice.

Regency of Blanche of Castille (1226–1236).—For more than a century, the sword of royalty, which was that of France, was valiantly wielded. But the son of Louis VIII. was a child of eleven years. A coalition of great vassals was at once formed in order to profit from his minority. Fortunately the regent, his mother, Blanche of Castille, was both clever and courageous. She won over one of the confederates, Theobald, the powerful Count of Champagne; and then, with the royal army, delivered him from the attacks of his former allies. In recognition of this service she obtained from Theobald, who had inherited the kingdom of Navarre, the important counties of Blois, Chartres, and Sancerre. A treaty signed in 1229 secured to a brother of the king the inheritance of the Count of Toulouse, and a marriage arranged between the second brother of St. Louis and the heiress of Provence prepared the way to a subsequent union of that district with France. Already royal seneschals had been established at Beaucaire and Carcassonne, so that the king found himself master, in his own right or in that of his brothers, of a great portion of the south of France. The majority of St. Louis was proclaimed in 1236; but the wise regent retained the greatest influence on the mind of her son and in the management of affairs.

Private Crusade (1239).—The great pontificate of Innocent III. had given fresh energy to the Church and to religious feeling. The crusading spirit, which had been extinguished during the rivalry of Philip Augustus with Richard Cœur de Lion and John Lackland, had just reawakened. In 1235, the holy war was again preached in France, and, as happened too often, before starting for Jerusalem the expedition was inaugurated by the massacre of those whose fathers had nailed the Holy Victim to the cross on Golgotha. Everywhere the Jews were slaughtered; the Council of Tours was obliged to take these unfortunate people under its protection. The heretics were treated with less pity. Theobald, Count of Champagne, caused a hundred and eighty-three of them to be burnt at once on Mount Aime, near Vertus. Moreover, this crusade, which included

Theobald himself and the dukes of Burgundy and Brittany, met with little success. The crusaders were defeated at Gaza, in Palestine, and those who returned only brought with them the honour of having broken a few lances on holy ground.

Firmness of Louis IX. towards the Emperor and the Pope.— Until his war against the English, St. Louis did little of note. But in 1241, Emperor Frederic II., having detained some French prelates who had gone to Rome to attend a council, St. Louis firmly demanded that they should be set at liberty: "Because the prelates of our kingdom have for no reason deserved their detention," he wrote, "it will be expedient for Your Majesty to set them free; you will thus allay our anger; for we regard their detention as an insult, and royal majesty would lose its title to respect if we kept silence in such a case. . . . May your imperial prudence . . . not confine itself to alleging your power or your will, for the kingdom of France is not so weak as to resign herself to being trampled under foot by you." The emperor gave up his prisoners. Some time before that Louis had refused to receive for himself and for one of his brothers the imperial crown of Frederic II. which the pope offered him. He had also refused the request of the pope that he should modify a royal ordinance of 1234, which restrained the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical tribunals, a necessary measure, for those courts had come to judge many more civil cases than did the lay tribunals.

Victory of Taillebourg (1242): Treaties of 1258 and 1259.— This man, who spoke so firmly, acted in like manner when he was compelled to take up arms. Attacked in 1242 by the English, who had supported the revolt of some of his barons, St. Louis defeated them at Taillebourg and at Saintes. He might possibly have succeeded in expelling them from France; he refused to follow up his victory. The acquisitions made during the last half century had trebled the royal demesne, but it seemed to him tarnished with violence. It was the profit of two confiscations. Through conscientious scruples he left to the King of England, by virtue of a treaty which was not signed until 1259, on his return from the crusade, the duchy of Guienne, that is to say, Bordeaux, Limoges, Perigeux, Cahors, Agenais, Santonge (south of the Charente), and Gascony, in fief of the crown. In order to guard against perjury, he compelled the lords who held fiefs from both crowns to choose between the two sovereigns. The frontier was equally uncertain in the south. He fixed it by a treaty with the King of Aragon, and the county of Barcelona ceased to depend on the crown of France (1258).

Oecumenical Council of Lyons (1245).—In 1245 Pope Innocent IV., expelled from Italy by Emperor Frederic II., took refuge in Lyons and held in the great church of St. John, the cathedral of that town, the thirteenth oecumenical council, which was attended by one hundred and forty bishops. The pope there solemnly deposed the emperor and exhorted the Christian princes to march to the deliverance of the Holy Sepulchre. In the previous year, the Christians of Palestine had been crushed by the Charzimans at the Battle of Gaza, and Jerusalem had once more fallen into the hands of the infidels.

First Crusade of St. Louis (1248–1254): Joinville.—St. Louis had not awaited the call of the fathers of the council to take the cross. During a dangerous illness in 1244, he made a vow to go to the Holy Land. His mother and his advisers in vain opposed this imprudent resolve. Louis once more left all power in the hands of Queen Blanche and embarked at Aigues-Mortes, a little town which then, as to-day, communicated with the Mediterranean by a lake, and which the king had bought from the monks of the abbey of Psalmodi, in order to possess a port on that sea; for Marseilles belonged to his brother, the Count of Provence. A great number of crusaders embarked from the latter town, among others the seneschal of Champagne, a friend of the king, the Sieur of Joinville, who shares with Villehardouin the title of being the first and best of the early writers of French prose. It was not without some regret that he consented to follow his master. On leaving Marseilles he passed before his castle. "But," said he, "I did not dare to look towards Joinville for fear that I should be overcome by regret and that my heart would fail me for having left my two children and my beautiful castle of Joinville which is so dear to me." On the banks of the Rhône he saw a castle "which the king had caused to be razed to the ground in order to punish the sieur who had the evil reputation of despoiling and pillaging all the merchants and pilgrims who passed." Joinville gives with the most charming frankness an account of his embarkation and the terror with which the sea inspired him: "We entered the ship in the month of August of that year at the rock of Marseilles, and the door of the ship was opened to admit our horses, those which we were to take beyond the sea. And when all had entered the door was shut and closed up as would be sealed a butt of wine, for when the ship is on the open sea all the doors are under water. Then the ship's captain cried to his men who were at the beak (the prow) of the vessel, 'Is your

work done? Are we ready?' And they answered, 'Yes, truly.' And when the vicars and clergy had entered they were all sent up to the deck of the ship to sing to the name of God that we should have a safe voyage. And all in a loud voice began to sing this beautiful hymn, *Veni Creator Spiritus*, from beginning to end, and while singing the mariners set sail by God's will. And immediately the wind rushed into the sails, and presently we lost sight of land so that we saw nothing but sea and sky; and each day we drew farther from our starting-place. And for this reason I must say that any man was very foolish who, knowing that he had in his possession the property of others, or having some mortal sin on his conscience, yet placed himself in such danger. For if one slept at night, one knew not whether one would be in the morning at the bottom of the sea."

When, five centuries later, the soldiers of France followed on the same waters a great captain, each evening there gathered round him on board the *Orient* the generals and wise men whom he had brought, and by ingenious or learned discussions on science or letters charmed away the boredom of the long voyage. On board the vessel of St. Louis there was not so much learning; but there were conversations and debates, and the differences of time in no way appears so clearly as in the diverse prepossessions of the minds of these men of the two ages, these pilgrims of faith and science. "Seneschal," said the king one day, "what is God?" "Sire, He is the best and most supreme thing that can exist." "Truly that is well answered, for this reply is written in the booklet which I hold in my hand. I will ask you another question: which would you rather be, a leper and sordid, or one who has committed a mortal crime?" "And I," said Joinville, who would never lie, "answered him that I would rather have committed thirty mortal sins than be a leper. When the brethren had gone he called me to him alone, made me sit at his feet, and said to me, 'How dared you say what you said to me?' And I answered him that I would say it again. And he said to me, 'Ha, foolish trifler, you are wrong, for you know that no leper is so hideous as a mortal sinner. And I pray you first for love of God, then for love of me, to stifle that saying in your heart.'"

St. Louis had, during the previous two years, stored up a large stock of provisions in the Isle of Cyprus. The army started from thence in 1800 ships, great and small, for Egypt. Dalmietta, at one of the mouths of the Nile, was taken (June 7, 1249), but precious time was lost before marching on Cairo. A delay

of five and a half months restored the courage of the Mamelukes. The crusaders spent one month in covering the ten leagues which separated them from the town of Mansourah. A badly begun fight proved fatal to many knights and to the Count of Artois, brother of St. Louis. "When the chaplain of the hospital," said Joinville, "came to ask St. Louis if he wished for news of his brother, the king answered, 'Yes, indeed, I would know whether he knew that he would be in Paradise.' The priest attempted to comfort him and praised the valour which the prince had displayed and the glory which he had acquired that day; and the good king answered that God was adored by all He had made. And, in spite of himself, great tears began to flow from his eyes, filling many great men who saw it with grief and compassion." (February, 1250.) Soon the army was surrounded by the enemy and decimated by pestilence. Joinville was very ill and "likewise his poor priest. One day it happened, that when mass was being sung before the seneschal in bed, when the priest had reached the passage of the Sacrament, Joinville saw him looking so ill that he swooned away before his eyes." The seneschal rose and ran to support him; "and thus did he finish the celebration of the mass, and sang no more, but died." The crusaders were forced to surrender (April). "The good holy man, the king," honoured his captivity by his courage and inspired even his enemies with respect for his virtues. They gave him up for a heavy ransom. On obtaining his freedom he travelled to Palestine, where he remained three years, employing his influence and zeal in maintaining concord between the Christians and his resources in repairing the fortifications of those places which they still occupied.

Crusade of the Shepherds (1251).—The news of these disasters only increased the popularity of the King in France; the people were blind to his faults as a general and thought only of the virtues he had displayed. The prelates and lords abandoned and betrayed him. They said, "It is for the poor to deliver him"; and an innumerable crowd of serfs and peasants assembled to cross the sea and to go to the help of the king. It was the crusade of *Shepherds;* but these people lived on the route by pillage; murders were committed; it was necessary to treat them with rigour. They were hunted like wild beasts.

Return of Louis to France (1254).—The news of the death of the regent (December, 1252) at last recalled Louis to France. Passing near Cyprus the king's galley struck a rock "which carried off quite three fathoms of the keel." Louis was advised

to go on board another ship. "If I left the vessel," he said, "five or six hundred persons who are on this one, and who love their bodies as I do mine, would not dare to remain after me, but would land on the Isle of Cyprus and lose all hope or means of returning to their country. I would rather place the queen, myself, and my children in danger and in God's hands than do so much harm to so many people." (Joinville.)

Administration of St. Louis.—The Capetian monarchy had made so much progress that at this period no lord dared say to his vassals, "Come and fight under my banner against the lord king," although this anarchical right was still recognised even by St. Louis in his *Establishments*, or collection of laws written for his demesnes. The Counts of Flanders and Brittany and the Duke of Guienne were almost the only men who had not come down to the condition of submissive vassals; but feudalism still retained immense prerogatives. St. Louis attacked them in the name of justice and religion.

Obstacles placed in the Way of Private Wars and Judicial Duels.—Private wars were almost forbidden by the *establishment* of the *quarantine of the king*, which was also attributed to Philip Augustus, and by the *assurance* which one of the parties might claim from the adversary or the suzerain, which obliged him to submit the decision no longer to arms but to a tribunal. St. Louis as a Christian did not desire these wars which hurried to God so many souls unprepared to appear before Him. As prince, he wished to put an end to the devastation of the country, "fires and obstacles placed in the way of ploughing." He forbade in his demesnes *judiciary duels* on civil matters, which submitted the decision of right to the hazard of strength or skill. The justice of the king thus took the place of individual force, and evidence by witnesses and procedure by writ replaced the *battles of justice*, for "battle is not the path to right."

Appeals and Royal Cases.—The lords dispensed justice on their estates. If the *vilain* could not avoid judgment, the vassal possessed the right of appealing to the suzerain from the sentence of his lord: for *default of right*, when the lord refused to render justice; for *false judgment*, when the condemned person considered himself injured by an unjust sentence. Moreover, the king favoured the custom of appealing directly to his court, which subordinated seigniorial justice to his own. The Duke of Brittany alone preserved the final resort. When a case carried before a seigniorial justice interested the king, by whatever right it might be, the bailiff interposed and claimed the judgment

as the king could not be amenable to the tribunal of a lord. These were royal cases. It was easy to increase them; no opportunity was lost of depriving the lords of jurisdiction and adding to that of the king.

The Court of the King and Civilians.—Royal justice was originally dispensed by the principal vassals and the great officials of the crown, who formed the *king's court*. But this court, being now obliged to judge written procedures, was gradually deserted by ignorant barons and left by them to scholar judges and civilians supplied by the burghers. Thus the commoners entered the *king's court;* soon the parliament was composed almost entirely of them. It was until the revolution the head of the third estate and, as it were, a fortress from which were dealt all the blows against feudalism.

The King's Justice.—The sending of *commissaries*, or *royal inquisitors*, throughout the provinces, a custom revived from the time of Charlemagne, wise *ordonnances* on administration, the reform of coinage and the police of corporations and trades, prove how vivid and consistent was his solicitude for the common weal. Neither rank nor birth were an excuse to him. His brother, Charles of Anjou, having bought and taken possession of some property which the owner did not wish to part with, Louis obliged him to return it. The Sieur of Coucy, one of the most powerful lords of the realm, had caused three young men to be hanged for hunting offences. The whole baronage pleaded for him. Louis condemned him to an extremely heavy penalty. One lord cried ironically, "Had I been king, I should have hanged all the barons, for, the first step taken, the second step costs nothing." The king, hearing him, replied, "What, John, say you that I should hang all my barons? Certainly I shall not do that, but I shall punish them when they transgress."

This reputation of the equity of the good king was so well established that the English barons in revolt against their prince entreated Louis to arbitrate between them, an example followed by the Counts of Bar and Luxemburg. But as for the heretics, they no longer felt themselves bound to follow his decisions. "No one," said he, "except a great ecclesiastic or eminent theologian should dispute with the Jews, but a layman, when he hears evil spoken of the Christian faith, must defend it not only by words but with the good sharp sword, plunging it as far as it will penetrate into the bodies of the unbelievers." He punished blasphemers by causing their tongues to be pierced with a red-hot iron.

Pragmatic Sanction (1268).—The piety of Louis IX., which caused him to be ranked with the saints, did not prevent him from publishing the *pragmatic sanction*, the first foundation of the liberties of the Gallic Church as opposed to the holy see. In it the liberty of canonical elections was confirmed, and the impositions which the Church of Rome could levy on the churches of France were confined to urgent necessities; they could not be imposed without the consent of the king and the clergy.

Weakness of the Communes.—St. Louis liked to remember that during his minority, when pursued to the very walls of Paris by rebellious vassals, he had been saved by the militia of the city, who came out to his assistance. His relations with the towns were regulated by a strong spirit of justice. He confirmed many charters and corrected a few. But communal independence seemed to him no better than feudal independence, and he favoured the conversion of communes into royal towns, depending on and superintended by the supreme power, all possessing their own chief, chosen by them in free elections. An ordinance of 1256, directed communes to appoint four candidates from among whom the king chose the mayor, who every year was obliged to go to Paris to give an account of his financial administration. Finally, the principle was established that the king alone possessed the right of making communes and that all owed fealty to him, "against all persons, alive and dead."

Thus the communes were to disappear, and with them their proud sentiments, the great ideas of right and liberty cherished by the men who had founded or defended them; but the third estate was to begin.

Burghers of the King.—It was round royalty that this third estate was formed. By *appeals* and by *royal cases* the king had extended his jurisdiction to the midst of the greatest feudal masses. His influence penetrated in another way. By acknowledging himself a burgher of the king, a dweller on a seigniorial estate might exempt himself from the jurisdiction of his lord.

Commerce, Industry, Police.—The abolition of private wars and the ordinance of St. Louis, which rendered the lords responsible for the police on the roads in the seigniories, introduced a certain measure of security into the country. Another ordinance particularly favourable to commerce was that which gave currency to royal money throughout the whole of France. At Paris, St. Louis instituted the royal watch and ordered the provost, Stephen Boileau, to draw up the old rules of the hundred trades

which existed in that town, so as to bring peace and order into industry as he had brought it into the country. These trades were later gathered into great corporations; in the fifteenth century, all the merchants of Paris formed six bodies of arts and trades.

Last Crusade of St. Louis.—In the year 1270, St. Louis undertook a second crusade, in which his faithful Joinville refused to follow him. It was directed against Tunis. The king died of plague beneath the walls of the town with the greater part of his army. He wished to die on a bed of ashes. Not long before, in another illness which had brought him to the brink of the grave, he had called his son and said to him, "Dear son, I beg you to make yourself beloved by the people of your kingdom, for truly, I would rather that a Scot came from Scotland and governed the people well and loyally than that you governed them badly."

Conquest of Naples.—The French had made another great expedition under that prince without the co-operation of royalty. Charles of Anjou, Count of Provence, summoned by the pope against Manfred, son of Emperor Frederic II., had conquered the kingdom of Naples in 1266. But the Latins, five years earlier, had lost Constantinople which the Greeks had re-entered. The direction of the second crusade of St. Louis was determined by the interested advice of Charles of Anjou, for the submission of the Bey of Tunis would safeguard Sicily from the continual attacks of the Saracens.

St. Chapelle, Sorbonne.—St. Louis had founded the almshouse of Quinze-Vingts for the blind as well as several hospitals; he had built the chapel of Vincennes and St. Chapelle, which is still admired in Paris, near the Palais de Justice, formerly the palace of the king. The crown of thorns which the Venetians had given to him was preserved there. His confessor, Robert of Sorbon, founded the Sorbonne, which became a theological power so celebrated throughout Christendom that it was called by Mézeray "the permanent council of the Gauls."

CHAPTER XXV

THE CIVILISATION OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

Grandeur of the Thirteenth Century.—The thirteenth century was the most remarkable period in the Middle Ages. Two great popes, Innocent III. and Innocent IV., then occupied the chair of St. Peter, a saint was on the throne of France, and on that of the empire sat Frederic II., a prince who, in any period, would have concentrated universal attention on himself. The Investiture Controversy between Rome and the empire had ended, and Italy had for a time, though unfortunately not for ever, emancipated herself from that union with Germany by which her national development had been checked. England had laid the foundations of her political liberty; the Great Charter was drawn up; Parliament was founded. The crusading movement had been finally defeated, save in Spain, where the Christian kingdoms were no longer in any danger from the Mohammedans, but the effects of those great undertakings still dazzled all beholders. That vast movement of men had served to produce a vast movement in things material and in the human mind. Commerce, industry, letters, and the arts soared to unknown heights. Schools were multiplied; the sphere of learning was extended and national literature arose. Men of eminence flourished—Albert the Great, St. Thomas Aquinas, Roger Bacon, and Dante. Had it not been for the wars which followed, the Renaissance would have dated from the thirteenth century.

Strength of the French Monarchy.—In France, during the century and a half which followed the accession of the Capetian dynasty, vast changes occurred. At this time the king was the great revolutionary, as the aristocracy had been in the days before Hugh Capet, as the people were to be after the epoch of Louis XIV.

The monarchy which, in the time of Philip I., had been confined in four or five towns, utterly overthrew the obstacles which barred its progress and made rapid advances towards absolute power. The king's peace was imposed upon the turbulent vassals of the crown; the king's justice and the king's money were established and the crown legislated for all.

Formation of the Third Estate.—The revolution from above

found its counterpart in a revolution from below. The people who had been nothing became something. In the eleventh century the *manants*, finding no protector and experiencing oppression from every side, united in self-defence. They wrested the right of self-government from their lords, built walls and towers, organised a militia, and elected magistrates. For a century and a half they lived in this way, enjoying a violent independence, but at the same time suffering from isolation and being perpetually on their guard against attack, since they had as enemies not only their former lords who had not forgotten their rights, but also some neighbouring town which viewed them with jealousy. As the monarchy advanced towards absolute power it conceived a distrust for these hotbeds of free discussion and independence. The citizens themselves, very often dissatisfied with their republican institutions, which laid financial burdens upon them, and with their isolation, which placed them in danger, permitted the crown about the middle of the thirteenth century to intervene in their affairs and to order their finances. This intervention became daily more frequent and the communes gradually disappeared. In place of being citizens of a town the urban population became the king's burghers. France thus escaped the danger of becoming, like Italy, the seat of a thousand republics, and hence of falling a prey for many centuries to internal anarchy and external attack. From another point of view, however, this revolution was unfortunate, since it went too far and effected the suppression of those urban liberties by the medium of which the nation might have acquired that thorough political education which it has always lacked.

But the great movement which the communes had inaugurated was not interrupted. If no more charters of communes were granted, charters of enfranchisement were made. As early as the twelfth century, the serfs had already been permitted to bear witness in the courts of justice, and some of the popes, Adrian IV. and, above all, Alexander III., of whom a celebrated bull is still extant, had demanded liberty for them. By the thirteenth century, enfranchisement had become very frequent, for the lords began to realise the truth clearly expressed by Beaumanoir and by many charters that it would be to their advantage to have on their lands free men and hard working rather than to preserve those lazy serfs " who neglect to work, saying that they work only for another's gain."

Then, among the lowest class of the population a dual move-

ment was taking place which, by depriving some of their exclusive rights, and by delivering others from serfdom, tended to unite all the non-noble into a single class, the members of which possessed political solidarity. Of all the lands which had communes and serfs, France alone created a third estate.

The Lawyers and Roman Law: Opposition to Feudal Law.—This new class, of which Bishop Adelbero under King Robert had known nothing, came to its birth inspired by a spirit altogether contrary to that by which its progress had so long been opposed. While feudalism, which depended for its very existence upon privilege, granted everything to the eldest son and thus prevented the free circulation of real property, the burghers inscribed upon their charters, on the principles of the law of reason, the equal partition of property among all the children.

This new law of the people, humble and despised as it was, would have been unable to enter into a contest with aristocratic law had it not found a powerful auxiliary in the ancient code of the Roman emperors. Knowledge of the *Corpus Juris Civilis* had long been obscured, though not entirely lost, when in the eleventh and twelfth centuries it revived. Roman law was largely studied in various Italian cities and above all at Bologna, where numbers of scholars drawn from the whole of Europe thronged round the chair of Irnerius, the reviver of juridical study. The French were the first to pass the mountains to hear these learned lessons, becoming the pilgrims of knowledge as their fathers before them had been pilgrims of the cross. Montpellier, Angers, and Orleans soon had their chairs of Roman law. Under Philip Augustus the compilation of Justinian was translated into French, and such was the power of attraction possessed by this new form of study that popes' councils solemnly forbade monks to engage in it, that they might not be thus distracted from meditation upon the lives of the saints. In the eyes of the men of this time, bewildered as they were in the maze of feudal institutions, the Roman code, a wonderful example of logical deductions founded upon natural equity and the common good, appeared to be in very truth that which they described it as being, reason reduced to writing. The rich burghers devoted their sons to this study and thus formed an army to oppose the feudal system, and by means of these laws, rendered doubly respectable by their origin and their age, the lawyers were able in a thousand ways to work for the deliverance of the people from the two great forms of mediaeval servitude, servitude of the person and servitude of the land. St. Louis permitted

Languedoc to adopt Roman law as its municipal code; other provinces later obtained a similar concession. In those districts which preserved the original legal system, Roman law, held in reserve to be consulted on all doubtful cases, insensibly modified the spirit of ancient customs. Thus there began in the thirteenth century that arduous struggle between rational law, whether Roman or customary, and the aristocratic law of feudal society, a struggle which the lawyers maintained and directed and which ended only at the great epoch of 1789 in the triumph of equality over privilege.

The *manants* sought only freedom for their goods and persons, civil liberty. They did not yet desire that which has become known as political liberty, and the most advanced among them willingly accepted the further principle of Roman law, that all should be equal under a master. The Roman emperor had once been the living embodiment of the law, *lex animata*. The lawyers converted the king into the heir of the emperors, and on its side the monarchy drew from the ranks of these lawyers its secretaries, proctors, and provosts, who were to administer France gradually reunited.

Two powers thus stood face to face. On the one hand was the aristocracy, owning the soil and controlling the military force of the kingdom. On the other hand was the monarchy, supported by the third estate and advised by the lawyers in its attempt to regain all the power which it had lost and to reunite to the crown the former prerogatives of imperial authority. At the time of the death of St. Louis it was already possible to see the direction in which these two forces tended. The monarchy already appeared as the sole source of justice and authority, and the third estate was constantly growing in knowledge and in wealth, the factors to which it always owed its influence.

Commerce.—Prior to the crusades, the towns of Italy, Provence, and Catalonia were alone able to disregard distance; those of Germany and France kept constantly to the beaten track. During the twelfth century Troyes in Champagne, Beaucaire in Languedoc, and St. Denis near Paris held annual fairs which were renowned throughout the whole of Europe. The merchants of Rome, Orleans, Reims, and other towns brought thither the rich manufactures of Flanders and the immense stores of Bruges. The traders of Lyons, Nîmes, Avignon, and Marseilles went twice a year to bring from Alexandria the riches of the East, which also came to France by way of Venice and the towns of Germany. Bordeaux already exported her wine

to England and Flanders, while the towns of Languedoc purchased at Toledo finely tempered weapons and at Cordova highly ornamented Moorish work. Paris had a *hansa* or guild for merchandise coming to it by water, and Philip Augustus confirmed the privileges of this association. From it came the ship which still appears in the city arms. St. Louis took the merchants under his protection.

New Forms of Industry.—The crusaders also brought from the East various new forms of industry. The textile work of Damascus was imitated at Palermo and Milan, and the glass manufacture of Tyre was imitated at Venice, where the old mirrors of metal were replaced by mirrors of glass. Windmills, linen, silk, and various useful plants, such as the plum-tree of Damascus, became known in western Europe. Honey, which alone had been known in ancient times, was replaced by sugar cane, though it could only be cultivated in Sicily and Spain, whence it was later carried to Madeira and the Antilles. This is also the period of the introduction of the mulberry, by which first Italy and then France was enriched. Cotton fabrics now became common. Paper made from cotton had been known as early as the tenth or eleventh century; linen paper dates from the end of the thirteenth century, though it was not until the sixteenth century that it generally took the place of parchment. Damasks and the engraving of seals and coins were perfected, the art of enamelling became known, and the work of goldsmiths attained a hitherto unknown excellence.

Guilds.—During the last days of the Roman Empire workers of the same profession had formed associations. The barbarians in their turn introduced into the lands which they invaded the institution of guilds, all the members of which swore to maintain their union, placed themselves under the protection of some god or hero, and consecrated their association by festivals from which the members of the guild acquired the title of boon companions. The Roman and Teutonic institutions were assimilated, and from this assimilation originated the mediaeval guild. These guilds were protected by Charles the Great and forbidden by the synod of Rouen (1189); they were, however, far too necessary in those times of violence not to survive all prohibitions. The members of a guild secured mutual support and help for the old, for widows, and for orphans. Each guild had its patron saint, its festivals, and its common fund. The heads of the guild, the syndics or jurats, supervised the policing of the body, prevented fraud, and secured that the rules of the society should be ob-

served. These rules required a long and severe apprenticeship and assured to the members of the corporation the monopoly of their form of industry, with the result that in each profession the numbers of " masters " was fixed by that particular craft guild. The results were an interference with the fluidity of labour, since freedom to enter a given craft no longer existed, and the maintenance of high prices. This severe discipline, however, was necessary to nascent industry. Eventually the guilds became an abuse, but in the thirteenth century they gave the labourer security in his work ; and it was from them that the bourgeoisie arose. The rules drawn up under the auspices of St. Louis for the guilds of Paris are still extant. The guild leaders had disciplinary power over their body, received a certain proportion of the guild revenues, and were even granted a measure of judicial power. They were, however, responsible to the provost for any disorders which might occur in their guild. .

State of the Rural Districts: Lack of Security.—The guilds afforded a certain measure of security to urban industry, but agriculture had no such protection. The forests and moors were of vast extent, and it was only round the cities and walled towns, round the strong castles and monasteries, that highly cultivated land could be found, since the peasant did not dare to venture into the country far from any place of refuge. Crespy in Valois affords a curious example of the ordinary type of town of the period. It had a long suburb from which it was divided by a fortified line and the suburb itself was protected by an encircling palisade. The burghers lived in the town ; the suburb served during the winter as a place of refuge for the peasants, their stock and their implements, and served a similar purpose at other seasons of the year when any danger threatened them. During their period of work in the country they had only huts such as the woodmen of the present day build in the great forests of France.

If the peasants were obliged to take such precautions, it is clear that they were still more necessary for the merchants. Beyond the tolls levied at the gates of every town, he was obliged also to buy a safe-conduct from every lord whose domains he traversed that he might be protected against robbery. Traders by sea had equally to submit to various exactions and especially to the horrible duty of wreck. When a shipwreck occurred the owner of the coast land appropriated everything that the sea cast up, even when the shipwrecked sailors reached the land with the cargo of the vessel that had

been lost. "I have here a stone more valuable than the diamonds which blaze in a royal crown," said a lord of Leon in Brittany, pointing to a rock famous for a number of shipwrecks which it had caused. And it was not unusual for the anger of the ocean to be aided by false signals which served to entice ships on to the rocks.

Attempts to Establish Security of Communications: Royal Money: The Jews and Bills of Exchange.—St. Louis revived a capitulary of Charles the Great which compelled the lords to keep up the roads and to guarantee safety to travellers from sunrise to sunset. In order to facilitate exchange, the same prince ordered that the money of the twenty-four lords who possessed the right of coinage should not be legal tender outside their estates and that, on the other hand, the king's money should be legal tender throughout the whole kingdom, an important step towards the abolition of seigniorial money.

As the Church forbade the taking of interest, usury abounded. The Jews alone were normally engaged in this form of industry since it was forbidden to the rest of the community, and this fact was one of the causes of the universal hatred which they aroused. It was the Jews also who, in order to realise their wealth and to facilitate its rapid circulation, invented bills of exchange, which annihilated the distance between the borrower and the lender, as steam has since destroyed the barrier of space between peoples.

Growth of Population.—The able government of Philip Augustus and St. Louis, which had recuperative effects, gave to mediaeval society that which it had hitherto lacked, a measure of order, peace, and security, and favoured to a remarkable extent the growth of population. Joinville bears witness to its considerable increase, and that increase is placed beyond all doubt when the great works accomplished during this period and the activity displayed in every direction are considered.

Universities.—There were few important abbeys to which a school was not attached, and the twelfth century witnessed the foundation within the limits of ancient Gaul of 702 new monasteries, the thirteenth century of 287. But the need of education had become so general that it was no longer satisfied by the monastic schools, and other schools were founded in all the large towns. Poverty and the great price of books made verbal instruction a necessity. Wherever a famous teacher fixed his chair, pupils assembled in crowds, but in the Middle Ages everything assumed a corporate form. At Paris, Angers, Orleans,

Toulouse, and Montpellier masters and disciples united and formed in each of those towns a body with extensive privileges under the name of a University. That of Paris received its statutes in 1215 from Philip Augustus ; students flocked to it from every land, since Latin, the language of the schools, was in the Middle Ages the universal tongue. The university was divided into four faculties, those of theology, of the decretals or canon law, of medicine, and of the arts, of which the last included instruction in the trivium, grammar, rhetoric, and philosophy, and further in the quadrivium, arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy. Roman law was especially studied at Orleans, medicine at Montpellier. The faculty of arts elected the rector to whom the other faculties owed obedience.

Extensive privileges attracted students to these universities. That of Paris numbered from fifteen to twenty thousand scholars who were not under the authority of the city magistrates, might not be arrested for debt, and often disturbed the city by their feuds and debauches, though seven popes and a great number of cardinals and bishops came from their number during the thirteenth century alone. Since the fall of the Roman Empire knowledge had remained in the hands of the clergy and had been imparted only to the members of that caste ; it was secularised by the universities. That of Paris, despite the fact that it was called "the eldest daughter of the kings" and "the citadel of the Catholic faith," nevertheless soon acquired a moral force so great throughout Christendom that kings and popes were compelled to reckon with it.

Scholasticism.—A child-like faith was characteristic of the Middle Ages, and it was long before the men of that period sought elsewhere than from theologians any solution to those great problems which disturb the soul when thought turns to the relationship between God and man. A spirit of inquiry, however, gradually revived, and at that moment philosophy, which had been silent for six centuries, revived also, though it possessed a peculiar character which has acquired for it a distinctive name, that of scholasticism.

In the eleventh century, St. Anselm, at the request of the monks of Bec, wrote his *Monologue*, in which he took as his thesis the bold supposition of an ignorant man seeking truth by the light of nature alone. In this tract, reason is no more than the handmaid of faith, since it was only with the object of establishing the religious verities that Anselm employed that reasoning which Aristotle had used to discover scientific truth. At a later

date the Spanish Jews translated from Arabic into Latin a large number of the works of Aristotle which had been unknown in the previous century, which possessed only some fragments of the *Organon*. The thirteenth century was overwhelmed by its possession of these new riches and the *Stagirite* reigned with undisputed authority in every seat of philosophy. Unfortunately, the enthusiastic study of Aristotle's works, which were only partially understood, had already warped the mediaeval intellect, turning it into a groove from which it only emerged with great difficulty. All knowledge was reduced to the art of reason ; an accurately constructed syllogism was regarded as proof. Scholasticism was thus not merely a certain system of philosophy or a mere set of views upon the great problems in which the human mind is interested. It was rather a particular method of discussing all questions, that discussion being based on certain premises which were unhesitatingly accepted or which were even taken as being axiomatic truths. As a result, scholasticism produced no ideas which might contribute to the advancement of mankind. It became a species of mental gymnastics in which the reward of effort was not the discovery of a truth, but a triumph won in some verbal conflict by the aid of subtle or ridiculous refinements and of a language which only the initiated could understand. Time and energy were wasted in these disputes, but the mind was exercised and developed in them and a weapon was forged for use in more serious conflicts.

The twelfth century was filled with great quarrels between Roscelin and St. Anselm, Abelard and William of Champeaux. The thirteenth century witnessed the lengthy debates of the Scotsman Duns Scotus and the Italian St. Thomas, both of whom studied and taught at Paris, both of whom gained a vast reputation, dividing between them the schools and Christendom and disturbing even the whole fourteenth century by the quarrels of their followers, the *Scotists* and the *Thomists*. They had been preceded in the University of Paris by the German Albert the Great, who was afterwards Bishop of Ratisbon, and whose learning secured for him the reputation of a magician.

Duns Scotus, St. Thomas Aquinas, and Albert the Great were all strangers to France by birth. After them may be mentioned Vincent of Beauvais, chaplain to St. Louis, not so much on account of the greatness of his intellect as for the interest which attaches to the encyclopaedia of contemporary knowledge, his *Speculum Majus*, a mediaeval parallel to Pliny's *Natural History*. It must, however, be added that until the thirteenth century

the Middle Ages lived among the ruins of antiquity without adding anything to them. Albert the Great began the revival of the art of observation, but invention appears only with Roger Bacon, an English monk, who also studied at Paris and who discovered, or at least explained in his writings, the composition of gunpowder, the nature of musical glasses, and the system of the air pump. He further recognised the need for a reform of the calendar, the changes which he suggested being exactly those which were ultimately adopted under Gregory XIII. Bacon died in 1294, after having spent many years in prison as a sorcerer and magician. It was also in Paris, "the city of philosophers," that the Spaniard Raymond Lull began to draw up his *Ars Magna*, a great but vain effort to produce a classification of the sciences and to construct a species of thinking machine which would have sterilised the intellect.

Astrology and Alchemy.—One of the products of the period was astrology, which became increasingly popular from this period until the sixteenth century and did not become extinct until the seventeenth century. The astrologers pretended to read in the stars the destiny of mankind. Human credulity was also exploited by the alchemists, who sought for the philosopher's stone, the means by which the baser metals might be transmuted into gold. Such idle researches, however, did produce some happy results. Astrologers, gazing persistently into the sky, were led to search out the laws which govern the movement of the heavenly bodies. The alchemists found no gold in their crucibles, but they did find new elements, or, as time went on, new properties of elements already known. To them mankind owes the discovery of the distillation of salts, acid solutions, enamelling, lenses from which spectacles are made, gunpowder, which the Arabs already knew, and the mariner's compass, which perhaps came from China.

Sorcerers.—We have noted the distortions of knowledge; mention must be made of the aberrations of the mind. Sorcerers abounded. Many of them believed sincerely that they were in relations with the devil, and a number of madmen who should have been medically treated were sent to the scaffold.

Literature : Development of the French Language.—One of the indications of the emergence of the French nation during the thirteenth century from the shadows of the Middle Ages is to be found in the fact that at this time its language finally freed itself from Latin forms and began to assume its true character. French became the medium of legislation ; in it were drawn up the

Assizes or Laws of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. Villehardouin, the historian of the fourth crusade, and Joinville, the biographer of St. Louis, had already written in French and their works are still read. In 1275 a Venetian produced a chronicle of his land in French, excusing himself for so doing by saying that this language "is spread throughout the world and is more sweet to the ear than any other." Ten years later, Brunetto Latini, the master of Dante, wrote his *Trésor* in French, "because the French language is most generally known among all nations."

The Trouvères.—At the very moment when Paris, owing to the reputation of its university, attracted to it the most eminent scholars of all Christendom, the vulgar tongue which its professors despised extended its empire far beyond the frontiers of France. It may even be added that French genius, which has been so often accused of sterility in poetry, at that time flooded neighbouring lands with verse. The troubadours disappeared from the time when the Albigensian crusade drowned the civilisation of Languedoc in blood; no more were heard the virile accents of a Bernard de Ventadour or of a Bertrand de Borne, or the soft love songs of the Courts of Love. But north of the Loire, the trouvères still composed their *chansons de geste,* true epics which were translated or imitated in Italy, England, and Germany. It may therefore be justly said that in the thirteenth century France possessed incontestably the intellectual dominion of Europe.

The most famous of these trouvères were Robert Wace, "clerk of Caen," who about 1155 wrote the *Brut,* a legendary history of the kings of England; Christian of Troyes (about 1160), author of the *Chevalier au Lion;* Marie of France, whose lays, touching and romantic stories, are extant, as well as some lyric poems like those of Audefroy the Bastard, each incident in which is a little drama in itself; Count Quesnes of Béthune, one of the ancestors of Sully, who went on the fourth crusade and sang of it; Theobald, Count of Champagne, who in his verses succeeded in recovering the harmony which had been so characteristic of the poetry of the troubadours; and, finally, poor Rutebeuf, a contemporary of St. Louis, the earliest example of the professional poet whose profession, however, hardly enriched him, since he suffered both from cold and hunger, though in the midst of such misery he remained jovial, witty, and bold, writing on every subject in a free and vigorous style which anticipated the work of Villon.

Fables: The Romance of the Rose, etc.—Among the authors

of those fables and daring stories which old France loved so well, and in which the clerk and the noble were already treated with scant respect, the best known is Rutebeuf. These attacks are found in the famous poem of *Renard*, a satire on feudal society, and in the most popular work of the time, *The Romance of the Rose*, by William de Lorris, another contemporary of St. Louis, and Jehan de Meung, who did not die until 1320. They were not afraid to say to the nobles:—

> "Que leur corps ne vaut une pomme
> Plus que le corps d'un charretier."

They even spoke irreverently of the origin of royal authority:—

> "Un grand vilain entre eulx esleurent,
> Le plus corsu de quant qu'ils furent,
> Le plus ossu et le greigneur (le plus grand)
> Et le firent prince et seigneur.
> Cil jura que droit leur tiendroit
> Se chacun en droit soy luy livre
> Des biens dont il se puisse vivre" . . .

These daring words were called forth by the bitter hatred which smouldered in the hearts of the *manants* and which burst into flame with so much fury in the middle of the following century with the savage rising of the *Jacquerie*.

These bold satirists, however, must not be mistaken for early revolutionaries. They represent the press of that period, and their verses are but an echo of all the rumours of the day, of all the emotions of the mob. But their chief object was to jest and laugh. They even joked about that which they most respected, the Church, and that which inspired them with the greatest fear, hell. Curious instances may be given of this simple temerity, one of the best known of which is the *Vilain qui conquist Paradis par plait*, in which can be read that common sense and vague sentiment of equity which were later to raise the French peasants from their decadence. "A *vilain* died without either devil or angel being interested, but his soul, looking straight towards Heaven, saw the Archangel Michael conducting one of the elect, and followed him to Paradise. St. Peter, having allowed the elect to enter, repulsed the *vilain*, swearing by St. William since no one had recommended him. 'Good Sir Peter,' said the *vilain's* soul, 'God made a great mistake when He made you an apostle and afterwards His doorkeeper, when you denied Him three times. Allow one who is more loyal than you to pass.' St. Peter, much ashamed, complained to his friend, St. Thomas,

who in turn attempted to turn this rude fellow out of Paradise. The *vilain* made a new jest. 'Thomas,' he said, 'it is well for you to be so haughty, you who would not believe in God till you had touched His wounds.' St. Thomas had recourse to St. Paul, who learned another home truth by meddling in this matter. 'Was it not you, lord Paul the Bald, who stoned Stephen and to whom the good God gave a shrewd blow?' Peter, Thomas, and Paul, having nothing to answer, carried their complaints to God Himself, before Whom the accused, the serf, was delivered by his speech and justified himself, and the *vilain* gained his case before the divine justice." In time he was to gain his case also before human justice.

Villehardouin and Joinville.—The most important literary event of the thirteenth century was the appearance of French prose. But the first prose authors were not professional writers; they were two famous lords intimately concerned in the events which they recorded. Geoffrey de Villehardouin, Marshal of Champagne, has left the history of the fourth crusade, the *Conquest of Constantinople*, in which he took part. He wrote as a soldier, with a firm and crisp style, not without a certain military roughness. He hardly composes, writing straight on of assault after assault, with short exclamations on points which interest him. The Sieur de Joinville, also a native of Champagne, shows in his *Memoirs* of the seventh crusade more art of style and more refinement of mind. He observes, reflects, talks willingly on everything, giving his own opinions as well as recording the events of the war. He anticipates Froissart, with the difference that Joinville was qualified to be the adviser and friend of the pious and excellent St. Louis.

Arts: Pointed Architecture.—The thirteenth century is marked in the history of art by the triumph of pointed architecture. The rounded arch was now broken, made slighter and raised, to bear nearer to heaven the roof of the temple and the prayers of the people. It was at this time that those monuments of chiselled stone were built, the cathedrals of Paris, Rouen, Amiens, Chartres, Reims, Bourges, Strasburg, and the Sainte Chapelle of St. Louis at Paris, which replaced Roman architecture, still heavy and massive, by temples which show boldness of thought and all the elevation and fervour of religious sentiment. The new style, born north of the Loire, crossed the Channel, Rhine, and Alps, and colonies of French artists bore it to Canterbury, Utrecht, Milan, and even to Sweden. A heavy, though simple, statuary decorated the gateways, galleries,

cloisters, while painted glass produced magical effects in the windows by secret processes which are lost in modern times. Missals and books of the hours were adorned by paintings in miniature, many masterpieces of which are extant.

The Italian Cimabue, the master of Giotto, began at Florence during this period the restoration of painting. Music was still backward, and only in the fourteenth century did the Flemish masters begin a revolution in this art.

The Mendicant Orders.—The thirteenth century saw an important innovation in the Church, the creation of the mendicant orders. St. Benedict had promulgated, about 529, a monastic rule under which all the western monks were eventually included and this rule imposed labour of the hands and of the mind. The Benedictines united agriculture to preaching, the copying of manuscripts to prayer. Schools were generally joined to their convents and contributed to prevent the utter ruin of letters. The various religious orders which were successively founded remained more or less faithful to this idea, retaining always the imprint of Benedict. The order of the Franciscans, founded in 1215 by St. Francis of Assisi, and the order of the Dominicans, founded in 1216 at Toulouse by the Spaniard St. Dominic, had an entirely different character. The members of these two orders, removed from the jurisdiction of bishops and forming a militia devoted to the holy see, were bound to live on alms, to possess nothing, to go about the world to carry the Gospel everywhere where the too wealthy clergy would not carry it, to the midst of the poor, in the alleys and on the roads. The influence of these ardent preachers on the people and on the Church itself was immense. The Dominicans, who had received the special mission to convert the heretics, were invested in 1229 with the functions of inquisitors, but the tribunal of the Inquisition, though it appeared in France at the time of the Albigensian crusade, never took root or extended there as in Spain and Italy. The Dominicans bore the name of *Jacobins* in France, because their first convent was built in the Rue St. Jacques. The order of the Franciscans or Friars Minor gave birth to the *recollets*, *cordeliers*, and *capucins*. Duns Scotus, the subtle doctor, Raymond Lull, and Roger Bacon were Franciscans ; St. Thomas, the universal doctor, and Albert the Great were Dominicans. The Carmelites and Augustinians were of the same period and formed with the Franciscans and Dominicans the four mendicant orders. Austerity and piety exalted these new monks ; the learning of some of their doctors excited the emulation of the older monks

and the regular clergy. As a result ecclesiastical discipline was revived. But at the end of the following century, that discipline was again and more seriously impaired.

CHAPTER XXVI

PHILIP III. THE BOLD AND PHILIP IV. THE FAIR (1270–1314)

Philip III. (1270–1285) : Extension of the Royal Demesne.— Little is known of the reign of the eldest son of St. Louis, though that reign lasted for fifteen years. It began under the walls of Tunis, whence Philip transported the corpse of his father, having imposed a truce upon the Saracens, by which they became tributary to the King of Sicily and paid the cost of the expedition against them.

But it is possible to follow, during the reign of this prince, the constant development of monarchical power. Without any fresh internal conflict, but as the result of the extinction of various feudal houses, Valois, Poitou, the county of Toulouse, and the county of the Venaissin were added to the royal demesne, though Philip III. ceded the last-named fief and half Avignon to the pope. The Count of Foix, defeated and taken prisoner in his capital, was compelled to swear faithful service and to surrender part of his lands. The rule of the King of France was thus extended to the Pyrenees, and it even crossed the mountains. Philip married his son to the heiress of the kingdom of Navarre, and though he failed to secure the throne of Castille for a prince under his own influence, and failed also to place the crown of Aragon on the head of his second son Charles, yet he displayed his arms in Catalonia, where he took the strong place of Gerona. Thus the Capetian dynasty, triumphant within the limits of its own territory, already made trial of its fortune in foreign lands. That trial was made prematurely, since the first part of the dynasty's work was not accomplished, and its accomplishment was a necessary prelude to the undertaking of the second portion of its mission.

The expedition into Catalonia, the result of which was unfortunate, originated only from family interest. Philip was anxious to punish Don Pedro, King of Aragon, for the support which he had afforded to the Sicilians in their revolt against Charles of Anjou, after the massacre of all the French in the island. This

massacre occurred during Vespers on Easter Monday, and is therefore known as the Sicilian Vespers (1282).

An ordinance of Philip III. compelled advocates in the royal courts, whose status was regulated in 1274, to swear each year that they would only undertake the defence of just causes. The first example of a commoner ennobled by the king is afforded by the case of Raoul, Philip III.'s silversmith, to whom letters of nobility were accorded in 1272.

Philip IV. (1285–1314): Wars of Guienne and Flanders.—Philip IV., surnamed the Fair, was only seventeen when he succeeded his father (1285). He freed himself as rapidly as possible, by treaties, from the useless wars in which his father had engaged, and applied himself to the far more useful task of increasing his demesne by acquisitions nearer home. His marriage with the heiress of Navarre and Champagne had already been worth two valuable provinces to him. A sentence of the parliament despoiled the heirs of Hugh of Lusignan of their territories La Marche and Angoumois and gave them to the king. Finally his second son married the heiress of Franche-Comté. Thus, by means of marriages, escheats, and conquest, all France was gradually being absorbed into the royal demesne. But some powerful vassals still remained, the Duke of Brittany, the Count of Flanders, and, above all, the Duke of Guienne. Philip at once attacked this last, a formidable adversary, since he was also King of England. Fortunately for the Capetian, Edward I., who was engaged in the conquest of Wales and the attempted absorption of Scotland, was too fully occupied in his own island to cross to the continent. The French army was able to make rapid progress in Guienne ; a French fleet even sacked Dover ; and another army, led by the king in person, entered Flanders, where the count had declared himself in favour of England, and defeated the Flemings at Furnes (1297). The mediation of Pope Boniface VIII. effected a peace between the two kings, which was sealed by a marriage, a daughter of Philip IV. wedding Edward I.'s son, and thus bringing to the English royal house those claims to the French throne which Edward III. was soon to assert (1299).

War of Flanders.—As a result of this peace the two kings sacrificed their allies, Philip the Scots and Edward the Flemings. The Count of Flanders, in alarm, submitted to Philip and his territory was reunited to the demesne (1300).

The whole court paid a visit to the new conquest. It was received with great pomp ; the Flemings, to do honour to their

noble guests, dressed themselves in their finest clothes and displayed all their wealth. The entry into Bruges was especially magnificent. The wives of the burghers exhibited so much gold and so many jewels in their dress that the French queen was wounded in her woman's vanity. "I believed," she cried, "that there was one Queen of France: I see six hundred." Flanders was in fact the wealthiest country in Europe, since its people were the most industrious. In that fertile land population had increased rapidly; towns were numerous, their inhabitants active, hardworking, and devoted to England, whence they secured the wool needed for their manufactures, as the towns of Guienne, especially Bordeaux, were devoted to the English, because England bought their wine. Flemish cloth was sold throughout Christendom, being found even at Constantinople, and the cities of the Low Countries were the market at which the goods of the North, coming from the Baltic, were exchanged for those of the South coming from Italy and Venice by way of the Rhine.

On a soil which had been drained only by the cutting of numberless canals, among numerous cities defended by their walls and by citizens accustomed to toil but yet proud of their numbers, strength, and riches, chivalry could not flourish and feudalism had little hold on Flanders. All the towns had their privileges; to attempt to infringe them was dangerous.

Financial Embarrassment of Philip IV.: Change in the Coinage. —The French monarchy, under Philip the Fair, was in a transitional stage, which compelled it to act in a vexatious and oppressive manner. In feudal times, the crown had no ministers to pay, since administration was unknown; no army to maintain, because the vassals were obliged to serve gratuitously. Those days had passed away. The royal demesne included, instead of merely four or five towns, two-thirds of France; it needed bailiffs, seneschals, provosts to maintain order and execute the laws, registrars to place its acts on record, judges to administer the laws, and councillors so carry on the work of government. The first six Capetians did not formulate a single general ordinance; a considerable number, dating from the one reign of Philip the Fair, are still extant. But all these officials required payment for their work. Wars were now carried on, not at some short distance, but in the Pyrenees, on the Garonne, and on the Scheldt. Where there had been a mere battle there was now a campaign. The feudal host was no longer sufficient. To keep his army with his standard for a period longer than that prescribed

by the condition of tenure, the king offered payment, and in case of need also enrolled mercenaries, whose loyalty was more dependable and whose service was more defined. For the Flemish war a fleet had been necessary, and to the ships of Poitou and Normandy Philip added sixteen Genoese galleys, for which he had to pay heavily. The King of England on one occasion sent 10,000 pounds sterling to the emperor, a similar amount to the Count of Gueldres, and almost twice as much to the Duke of Brabant, and a vast coalition was thus formed against France; the livres of Tours were called upon to undo the work accomplished by the pounds sterling.

With the progress of industry, commerce, and art, luxury developed and life, especially at the court, became more expensive. Expenses increased daily while the revenue remained stationary, and became constantly less adequate. Philip the Fair, always in need of money, was compelled to have recourse to every expedient by which he might augment his resources, and as the science of finance is a modern creation, the expedients employed were ruinous for the people, without benefiting the government to any considerable extent. Thus, when he robbed the Jews and the Lombards, the bankers of the period, he caused a dearth of coin; when he debased the coinage he rendered commerce impossible; when he promulgated sumptuary laws he ruined industry. He imposed taxes on the Flemings and they revolted; on the clergy and thus embittered his quarrel with Boniface VIII. He destroyed the Order of Knights Templars in order to appropriate their wealth, and thus left a bloody memory behind him. Only one of his financial expedients was praiseworthy: he sold their freedom to the majority of the serfs on his demesne and commuted their dues for money payments.

These characteristics are not peculiar to the reign of Philip the Fair; they explain the whole fourteenth century. Every king debased the coinage, because every king was in need of money and knew no other means by which it might be procured, though this fact excuses neither the fraud, nor the exactions, nor the violence of which kings at this period were guilty. To escape a difficulty by resort to dishonest expedients is to cease to govern, and despite the explanations which can be supplied of his conduct, Philip IV. thoroughly deserved his unsavoury reputation.

New War of Flanders (1302–1304): Battle of Courtrai (1302).—Philip had appointed Jacques de Châtillon governor of

Flanders, a man who believed it to be needless to conciliate a conquered people, especially a conquered people possessed of so much wealth. The Flemings, little tolerant and accustomed to greater prudence in their counts, revolted, and in Bruges alone three thousand Frenchmen were massacred. Philip sent Robert of Artois with a numerous army to avenge this injury. Twenty thousand Flemings boldly awaited the advance of the chivalry near Courtrai, behind the canal. Before the battle the burghers confessed their sins, and their priests celebrated a solemn mass ; all knelt and taking some of the earth, put it to their mouths, swearing to fight to the death for the liberties of their land. The meditation of a whole army is usually of ill augury for its opponents. The French advanced without order, assured that they were about to conquer and not doing their low-born opponents the honour of supposing that they would dare to face the nobility of France. In vain the Constable Raoul de Nesle urged prudence ; he was asked if he was afraid. " Sire," he answered Count Robert, " if you follow where I lead, you will be well in the forefront of the fight." And he jumped quickly on his horse, urging it forward. No care had been taken to reconnoitre the position of the Flemings. The first ranks of the dense column of knights were engulfed in the canal which covered the enemy's line. Those in front, pressed forward by those behind, were overthrown, and the Flemings had only to run their long lances into this mass of men and horses to kill them without risk to themselves. A sortie which they made from the two ends of the canal completed the rout ; two hundred lords of high birth and 6000 men-at-arms perished. The most shameful incident of the day was the fact that the Duke of Burgundy, the Counts of St. Pol and Clermont, and 2000 lances fled, leaving the constable, the Count of Artois, and many noble warriors to be beaten, cut off, and killed by the hands of bondsmen.

The Battle of Mansourah had already displayed the undisciplined temper and military inexperience of the knights, but it had occurred in the East and distance had thrown a glamour over the defeated side. The Battle of Courtrai, lost by the flower of chivalry to bondsmen, caused a notable sensation, though it did not cure the nobles of their rash presumption. The defeats of Crecy, Poitiers, and Agincourt were the result of the same causes which produced the disaster of Courtrai. The feudal nobility, despoiled of its privileges by the crown, lost on these battlefields the prestige by which it had been so long surrounded,

and saw, to complete its ruin, another army, that of the king and the people, rise by its side.

Battle of Mons-en-Puelle (1304).—Philip the Fair took energetic measures to repair the disaster of Courtrai. He compelled nobles and burghers to bring their gold and silver vessels to the royal treasury, paying them in his debased coinage. He ordered that all land of the value of a hundred livres should supply a knight, that every hundred bondsmen should supply six foot soldiers, and that every commoner having twenty-five livres income should serve in person. He sold freedom to many serfs, nobility to many commoners. In these ways, and in two months, he revived the strength of the kingdom, and it was considerable; that of the burghers was greater still, and the cities of Flanders put 80,000 combatants in the field. With such forces arrayed on either side, the struggle would have been both terrible and decisive; the fact was realised and, as there was no wish to run great risks, the year (1302) passed while the two parties merely watched one another. Philip was then at the most critical stage of his quarrel with Boniface VIII., and a fresh reverse would have been fatal to him. In the following year (1303), he even permitted the Flemings to take the offensive. But the pope died, and forthwith Philip attacked the Flemings by land and sea (1304). His fleet gained a victory near Zirickzee, and at Mons-en-Puelle he revenged the reverse of Courtrai. He thought that the Flemings were crushed, but in a short time they appeared in sufficient numbers to offer a new battle. "It rains Flemings," cried the king, and preferred to treat rather than to fight. He was promised money; Douai, Lille, Béthune, and Orchies, with all Walloon Flanders, the French-speaking district between the Lys and the Scheldt, was ceded to him. On these terms, he restored their count to them, with a mere promise of feudal homage. The French monarchy thus fell back before Flemish democracy, as monarchy in Germany, at almost the same time, fell back before Swiss democracy. The French communes, remaining divided, fell; in Flanders and in Switzerland the communes united and triumphed.

Quarrel with Boniface VIII.—The quarrel between Philip the Fair and Boniface VIII. began in 1296 on the question of the taxes which the king imposed upon the French churches. In the following year peace appeared to be restored and Boniface sealed his reconciliation with the French crown by canonising St. Louis. But the dispute presently revived as a result of the pope's haughty interference with the internal affairs of the kingdom. One of

his legates, Bernard Saisset, Bishop of Pamiers, braved the king to his face. The days of Gregory VII. had passed; the king caused the bishop to be arrested on the ground that he had plotted against royal authority, and required his metropolitan, the Archbishop of Narbonne, to inflict canonical degradation upon him. The archbishop referred the matter to the pope who threatened to excommunicate the king for having dared to lay hands on a bishop. At the same time, Boniface launched his bull, *Ausculta, fili,* in which he reproached the king with having burdened his people, clerk and lay, with cruel exactions; with having encroached upon ecclesiastical jurisdiction; with having destroyed the effect of episcopal sentences; and with having devoured the revenues of the churches when vacant by abusing his regalian right. At the same time, the pope allowed his claim to appear, that there was in the realm a second power beside that of the crown, the power of the holy see. "God," said Boniface, "has appointed us, unworthy as we are, over kings and over kingdoms, to destroy them, to overthrow them, to disperse, edify, and plant them in His name and by means of His doctrine. Let no one persuade you that you have no superior and that you are not subject to the head of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. He who thinks such thoughts is a madman; he who supports such doctrines is an infidel."

The attack of the pope on the maladministration of Philip was well-founded, but neither king nor pope had any clear idea as to the bounds of the temporal authority of the former and of the spiritual authority of the latter. All wrong acts being sinful, the pope believed that he had the right to judge and to punish with the thunders of the Church the blameworthy acts of the prince, and the prince, on his side, guided by the lawyers, who, following the spirit of the civil law, assigned absolute power to the king, believed that he had the right to interfere with the administration of the churches and wished the bishops, like the rest of his subjects, to be subjected to his officials and to his tribunals. These conflicting claims produced a deplorable quarrel. Philip declared in a plenary court that he would renounce his children as his heirs if they humbled themselves to recognise any other power except God as being superior to themselves in temporal affairs. He caused the papal bull to be burned publicly (February 11, 1302), and to win the nation to his side in the great quarrel, he summoned to him the deputies of the States-General, divided into the three orders, clergy, nobles, and bourgeoisie or third estate (April 10, 1302). "To

you, most noble prince," said the deputies of the third estate, "to you our lord Philip, the people of your realm make prayer and demand that you preserve the free sovereignty of this state, which is such that you shall recognise no sovereign in these lands in temporal matters save God." Thus the first words uttered by the people in France were a cry of national independence.

The king assembled them again in the following year, and, trusting in the strong support which he received from these representatives of the country, he pursued the struggle to the bitter end. The pope was threatened with a general council, before which Philip proposed to accuse him, and on his side prepared a bull declaring the deposition of the king. Philip had foreseen this move. William de Nogaret, one of his agents, whose grandfather had been burned as an Albigense, entered Italy and effected an understanding with Sciarra Colonna, a Roman noble and the pope's deadly foe. Boniface was then at his native place of Anagni. By means of bribery, Nogaret won over the commander of the militia of the town, and one morning entered the place at the head of four hundred men-at-arms and some hundreds of infantry. Hearing the noise which they made in the town, and the cries, "Death to the pope! Long live the King of France!" Boniface believed that his last hour had come. The vigorous old man, despite his eighty-six years, showed no sign of weakness. He put on the pontifical robes, seated himself on his throne, the tiara on his head, his cross in one hand and the keys of St. Peter in the other, and thus awaited the murderers. They called on him to abdicate. "Here is my breast, here is my head," he answered. "Betrayed, as was Jesus Christ, if it must be that I die as He died, at least I will die pope." Sciarra Colonna tore him from his throne, struck him in the face with his gauntlet, and would have killed him, if Nogaret had not prevented it. "Caitiff pope," cried the grandson of the Albigense, "think and take notice of the goodness of my master, the King of France, who, far as his realm is from you, guards and defends you by my hand."

Death of Boniface VIII. (1304): Election of Clement V. (1305).—Nogaret hesitated to remove the old man from Anagni, and so left the people time to recover from their stupefaction. The citizens armed and the peasants hastened in from the neighbouring districts; the French were expelled from the town. The pope, fearing that poison would be mixed with his food, had remained three days without eating. Shortly afterwards, he died of shame and anger at the insults to which he had been subjected.

His successor, Benedict XI., attempted to avenge him by excommunicating Nogaret, Colonna, and all who had aided them, the excommunication also touching the king in this way. A month after publishing this bull, Benedict was found poisoned. On this occasion Philip took steps to make himself master of the new papal election. Bertrand de Goth, Archbishop of Bordeaux, was designated for the papal chair, having promised to comply with all the king's wishes. He took the name of Clement V., was consecrated at Lyons, and abandoning Rome, established himself in 1308 at Avignon, a possession of the holy see beyond the Alps, where, however, he found himself in the power and under the control of the King of France. His successors remained there until 1376, and this residence of the popes at Avignon, which weakened the papacy, was known as the Babylonian Captivity.

Condemnation of the Templars (1307).—When Philip offered the papacy to the Archbishop of Bordeaux, he imposed his own terms upon him. One of the conditions exacted was nothing less than the destruction of the military Order of the Templars. The wealth of these monastic warriors, useless since it was no longer expended in arming against the infidels, attracted the cupidity of the king, always in need of money, and their power was offensive to his despotic temper. They numbered 15,000 knights, with an unknown number of serving brothers and novices; so that, if united in one host, they could have defied all the royal armies in Europe. They held in Christendom more than 10,000 manors and a number of fortresses, including that of the Temple in Paris, where Philip had found a safe refuge during a riot which broke its force in vain against those thick walls. In the treasury of the Order there were 150,000 gold florins, in addition to silver coins and precious vessels. A strict organisation, by which the knights were kept under the control of the grand master, made the body even more formidable than it was by reason of its valour and wealth. No one knew what passed in the halls of the Order; all was secret, and no profane eye had ever beheld its mysteries. But vague report told of orgies, scandals, impiety. Some knights had disappeared because, it was said, they had threatened to make compromising revelations. The pride of the Templars angered the people and odious crimes were charged to their account. They were guilty only of a great relaxation of discipline, while their religious ceremonies had probably been infected in the East with unorthodox ideas and bizarre customs.

On September 14, 1307, all the seneschals and bailiffs of the

kingdom were warned to hold themselves ready and armed for October 12; at the same time they received sealed letters, which they were not to open under pain of death until the night of October 12–13. The knights were taken by surprise and had time neither to resist nor to concert their defence. Torture, as usual, extracted confessions from its victims. Philip wished to unite the nation with himself in this great trial, as he had united it with him in his quarrel with Boniface VIII. The States-General assembled at Tours; the charges against the knights and their confessions were produced before the deputies, who declared that the accused were worthy of death. Provincial councils reinforced this condemnation, and the Council of Paris caused forty-five Templars who had retracted the confessions made under torture to be burned in one day at a slow fire in the Faubourg St. Antoine. Nine were burned at Senlis and there were certainly other executions. At the Council of Vienne, the pope pronounced the dissolution of the Order throughout Christendom. Its great possessions were transferred to the Knights Hospitaller, or Knights of Rhodes. But the royal treasury did not so easily relinquish what it had seized. All the money found in the Temple, two-thirds of the movables, and all outstanding debts, with a large number of estates, remained in the hands of the king. In Italy, England, Spain, and Germany the Order of the Temple was abolished and its goods partially confiscated by the kings. Executions occurred only in France.

Heresies.—The Council of Vienne also condemned many errors which had appeared in the ranks of the Franciscans. Among these were the *Spiritualists*, who held that St. Francis was a new incarnation of Jesus; the *Beggars*, who regarded man as absolved from all obedience to human law when rendered perfect by conversion; the *Fraticelli*, who held that private property should be abolished and declared that all things should be common, families no less than goods. These wild doctrines were very old. A *Beggar* was burned in the Place de Grève in 1313.

Last Years of Philip the Fair.—The last years of this reign were even more gloomy than those which preceded them. After six years, the great dignitaries of the Order of the Temple seemed to lie forgotten in their prisons. In 1313 they were brought out, appeared before a papal commission, and were condemned to be imprisoned for the rest of their days. But the grand master, Jacques Molay, and another dignitary at this time withdrew their confessions, to the great alarm of the commission, which thought that the terrible affair was at last ended. While the

commissioners deliberated, Philip caused the two Templars to be seized; a scaffold was hastily erected where the statue of Henry IV. now stands near the Pont Neuf, and the two victims were burned (March 11). A popular legend grew up concerning their death: that the grand master, from his scaffold, adjured his executioners to appear with him before God, the pope in four months, and the king in a year.

Bloody tragedies occurred even in the heart of the king's family. His three daughters-in-law, accused of indecent conduct, were arrested and placed in strict confinement. One, Margaret of Burgundy, imprisoned at Château-Gaillard, was afterwards strangled; another died of a broken heart; and the third was taken back by her husband. Their accomplices, Philip and Walter d'Aulnay, were burned alive on the Place de Grève, and many other nobles and commoners were tortured, sewn up in sacks, and hurled into the river.

Meanwhile popular anger increased against a government which debased the coinage and forbade, under pain of death and forfeiture, the importation of foreign money or the assaying of the royal money, the latter prohibition being intended to prevent the discovery of its real value by detecting the amount of alloy. As these changes in the coinage did not suffice to satisfy the needs of the treasury, a tithe was levied on the clergy under pretence of a crusade; the king exacted aids from his vassals for the knighting of his sons and for the marriage of his daughter with the English king, and further imposed arbitrary imposts, *male-toltes*, on the whole community. Popular anger found vent in murmurs; the murmurs were embittered by executions. The universal oppression led to an actual revolt when Philip established a new tax on the sale of all commodities. A league between the nobles and the commons was foreshadowed, similar to that which in England laid the foundation of public liberty and wrested Magna Carta from John Lackland. Philip gave way. The impost was abandoned; the deputies of forty good towns were summoned to Paris to consult with the king, and were promised that henceforth only good money should be coined.

But this sinister man, the hardest king who had yet ruled in France, died at the early age of forty-six (November 29, 1314).

Territorial Gains.—During this reign some important territorial gains were made, all of which, however, were not permanent. The counties of La Marche, Angoumois, Champagne, Franche-Comté and Lectoure, part of Flanders (Lille, Douai,

and Orchies), Quercy, the great city of Lyons, and part of Montpellier were annexed. The Count of Bar was compelled to do homage to the French crown for all the lands which he held west of the Meuse.

The Parliament.—Vassals were compelled to serve their lord in his court in the giving of council and in the administration of justice. The feudal court had these two characteristics; the king sought from his barons advice and sentence. As the power of the crown increased, the functions of the royal court developed. It became necessary to effect a differentiation of duties, and thus there arose the political court or great council and the judicial court or parliament. Under St. Louis, the character of the latter body was still not clearly defined. Philip the Fair effected its organisation. He ordered it to meet at Paris twice a year for a session of two months in the Palace of La Cité which later acquired the name of the Palais de Justice (1302). This sovereign court of justice, which claimed to have jurisdiction over the whole kingdom, was destined to become the great instrument by means of which the kings reduced all France under their absolute authority. Philip also established two exchequers at Rouen and two *grands jours*, judicial commissions, at Troyes; but over these provincial courts there presided commissaries drawn from the parliament. The institution of the public ministry or magistrates, employed to defend in all cases the rights of the crown and of society, appears to date from this reign.

Chamber of Accounts.—As Philip had drawn the parliament from the great council or royal court, so he drew from the parliament the chamber of accounts, which was at first part of the parliament, but later became distinct from it. There were thus three main bodies dealing with the administration of the realm: for justice, the parliament; for finance, the chamber of accounts; and for policy, the great council or privy council.

Ordinances of Philip IV.—The numerous ordinances of Philip IV. which are still extant show his activity in organising that new administration which the crown was compelled to give the kingdom since it had usurped the place once occupied by the feudal lords. If these laws are often marked by a despotic and fiscal spirit, some show a true sense of government. One ordinance forbade private wars and trial by battle during the times at which the king was at war, and the effect was to disarm feudalism. Another (1313) forbade lords to coin money, and in the following year the deputies of the towns demanded from the king that this prohibition should be maintained for eleven years.

It was decided, in conformity with an example already given by St. Louis, that an appanage or lands ceded by the king to one of his sons should revert to the crown in default of male heirs, a method by which the unfortunate results of the great grants made to members of the royal house might to some extent be avoided. The Capetians did not partition the kingdom as the Merovingians had done, but the partitioning of the royal demesne occurred, with the result that these kings pulled down with one hand that which they built with the other, striking down the older feudalism to replace it with a new feudalism in the fiefs which they granted to their sons. An ordinance of 1298 abolished all personal servitude in the seneschalries of Toulouse and the Albigeois in return for a small annual money payment.

Finances.—Attention has been drawn to the financial embarrassments of Philip the Fair and to the expedients which he adopted to raise revenue, the debasement of the coinage and confiscations. He did more in creating the *douanes* on the frontiers, by which he struck at the exportation of commodities, and in levying new imposts. Hitherto the king had been possessed of no regular revenues other than those of his demesne lands. Vassals and subjects paid *aides*, *taille*, and *gabelles* (excise duties) only in certain defined circumstances. The constant wars of Philip IV. made these taxes permanent, since he required to be *aided* now against the English, now against the Flemings. But since, under the feudal system, these *aides gracieuses* or *droits de complaisance*, as such voluntary gifts were called, could be levied only with consent, the king was forced to assemble meetings of provosts, bailies, or even of the whole realm. These assemblies gave rise to the provincial states and to the States-General.

First States-General (1302).—The most important event in the administration of Philip the Fair was the summoning (1302) of the first States-General, composed of deputies of the three orders, clergy, nobles, and commons. It was thus the most despotic of French kings who revealed to the people their rights and their destiny. Rendered anxious in the face of a great danger, and ruined by his constant activities, he was driven to call round him the deputies of the nation, to gain from them the help which he needed, and to protect himself against the pope by the assent of France. But by discussing with them the prerogatives of the crown and of the tiara, he recognised by implication the old right of national sovereignty which had been so thoroughly obscured and forgotten for centuries. Philip IV.

doubtless sought only to secure needed help. But the men who in 1302 fought for the king against the pope, and who in 1317 disposed of the crown, were emboldened at a later date to lay hands on the crown itself.

CHAPTER XXVII

THE THREE SONS OF PHILIP THE FAIR (1314–1328)

Louis X. (1314–1316).—Three sons of Philip the Fair reigned in succession, Louis X. *le Hutin* (the burly) or *le Quereleur* (the quarreller) (1314–1316), Philip V. the Tall (1316–1322), and Charles IV. the Fair (1322–1328). The first of these princes only wore the crown for eighteen months and only three events are associated with his reign, the murder of Margaret of Burgundy, whose husband caused her to be strangled at Château-Gaillard; an expedition against Flanders which ended in failure, since the French did not advance beyond Courtrai and almost their whole army perished in the Flemish mud; and finally a vigorous recrudescence of feudalism which overthrew the advisers of Philip IV. and attempted to undo the work of that king. Enguerrand de Marigny, the late king's finance minister, was hanged at Montfaucon, on a gibbet which he had himself constructed. Peter de Latilly, chancellor of France, and Raoul de Presle, advocate-general, were tortured; Nogaret was ruined. The nobles in many provinces regained the privileges of which they had been deprived: their old rights of justice were restored with trial by battle and the right of private war; procedure by written depositions, which made the king's lawyers necessary, was abolished; the royal judges were deposed, and so forth. The general demand, which was a clever move on the part of the nobles, was that the king should no longer have relations with the vassals of his barons. At the same time, however, in order to procure some money, Louis made a solemn declaration that "according to the law of nature, all are born free," from which it followed that as all Frenchmen were naturally free, the serfs on the royal demesne might purchase their liberty. From this time serfdom constantly declined; in contrast to that which had occurred in previous periods, liberty became the rule for rural, as it had long since been for urban, populations, and such serfdom as survived was an exception. The last serfs were freed only in the reign of Louis XVI.

Philip the Fair had expelled the Jews; Louis allowed them to return on condition that they surrendered to him two-thirds of their property. The Jews were then regarded as sponges which might be squeezed at pleasure. They were expelled that their goods might be confiscated and they were recalled with a view to future confiscations.

The Salic Law.—Louis X. left only a daughter, but the queen, Clementine of Hungary, gave birth some months later to a posthumous son, John, who lived only eight days. The question arose as to whether his sister should take the crown. A text in the Gospels says, "the lilies toil not . . . and yet even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these." This clearly indicated that the kingdom of the lilies ought not to pass to the distaff. Such reasoning had weight in the fourteenth century, and there were other arguments against a female succession. There was no desire that a stranger should acquire France by marriage, and therefore the States-General applied to the crown that rule of succession which was said to have applied anciently to Salic lands. They excluded the daughter of Louis X. from the throne, and thus the right of women to succeed, which was recognised in fiefs, was not accepted for the succession to the crown.

Philip the Tall, after being regent for five or six months, was proclaimed king in place of his niece (1316). This decision told against the new king himself, for he also only left daughters who were disinherited in favour of their uncle, Charles IV. This last prince was predeceased by his two sons and his widow gave birth to a daughter who was equally excluded from the throne. Charles himself said to his barons on his deathbed, "If the queen gives birth to a son he will be your king; if it be a daughter the crown belongs to Philip of Valois, and I appoint him regent" (1328). The path was thus opened for the accession of a new branch of the Capetians, the Valois.

Philip V. (1316–1322).—The reigns of Philip V. and Charles IV. contain few events of military importance, but are marked by many measures for the organisation of the administration of the country. Philip V. three times summoned the States-General, the periodicity of which seemed to be established, and he excluded the clergy from the parliament in order that this body might only contain members fully subject to royal authority. The clergy afterwards returned as clerical councillors. Philip instituted (1318) the Privy Council or Council of State, which was the deliberative body; the officers of the crown and the

clerks of the closet, from which later arose the secretaries of state, were the executive body. He wished to establish uniformity of money, weights, and measures, in order that the people might trade more securely, and he issued many ordinances, showing a remarkable spirit of order and economy, concerning finance, the chamber of accounts, the administration of lakes and forests, and other matters. The royal demesne was declared to be inalienable and irreducible. During this reign there was a cruel persecution of Jews and lepers.

Letters of Nobility.—Like his grandfather Philip III., Philip the Tall gave to his commoners letters of nobility, an innovation which, by bringing fresh blood into the aristocracy, ensured its vitality but changed its character. Originally nobility had been personal; feudal nobility was an attribute of a fief. The kings separated the noble from the fief, and the change was important, since when letters of nobility might be bought there could be no true aristocracy. All might be noble by paying.

Rural Communities.—Threatened from above by the kings, the feudal spirit was threatened from below by the people. The progress of the towns continued and that of the rural districts began. The citizens secured from Philip V. the right to form military bodies; each town had a captain for the burgher militia, each bailiwick had a captain-general, and in this century, if not in this reign, ecclesiastical parishes became civil communities. Already the people of the rural districts, who had been isolated, were becoming united, first under the Church and under the supervision of the baron's intendent, and later under a syndic or mayor always nominated by the local lord and having the duty of summoning the people to discuss their common interests. Thus municipal organisation spread to the country, a change first noted in a document in 1380.

Charles IV. (1322–1328).—Charles IV. published various edicts relating to trade; he increased the export duties, expelled the Lombard merchants who had been recalled by Louis X. and whom he sent back to their own land as naked as they came. But he showed a just severity. The Baron of l'Ile en Jourdain, convicted of various crimes, was hanged despite the prayers of all the nobles and the intervention of his uncle, the pope. Abroad, Charles supported the revolution in England which drove Edward II. from the throne and received the homage of Edward III. for Guienne and Ponthieu. In Germany, he almost obtained the imperial crown. But an evil fate pursued his house. These princes, tall and handsome, who seemed to be

destined to a long career, died in the flower of their age ; Philip IV. was forty-six ; Louis X. was twenty-seven ; Philip V. was twenty-eight; and Charles IV. was thirty-four. The people saw in these early deaths the vengeance of Heaven on the family which had overthrown Boniface VIII., possibly poisoned Benedict XI., and murdered the Templars.

The Middle Ages, at least in France, drew to their close, since all that was dear to them, the crusades, chivalry, and feudalism, had now either passed away or was passing. The papacy, ruined in prestige under Boniface VIII., was captive at Avignon ; the successor of Hugh Capet was a despot; and the sons of commoners sat in the States-General of the realm opposite to nobles and clergy.

SEVENTH PERIOD—THE HUNDRED YEARS' WAR: RENEWED ANARCHY

(1336–1453)

CHAPTER XXVIII

PHILIP VI., FOUNDER OF THE LINE OF CAPETIAN-VALOIS (1328–1350)

Power of the King of France before the War with England.—Philip VI. of Valois, cousin of Charles IV., nephew of Philip the Fair, and grandson of Philip III., acquired the crown in virtue of the Salic Law, which had three times in twelve years been interpreted in a sense contrary to the rights of female heirs. Edward III., King of England, grandson of Philip IV. by his mother Isabella, protested against his exclusion and claimed the crown; but the internal troubles of England forced him to recognise the right of Philip VI., to whom he did homage for the duchy of Guienne. The victory of Cassel, gained by Philip over the rebellious subjects of the Count of Flanders, gave the new royal house the sanction of glory (1328).

The Flemings had placed on their standards the insulting device:—

"Quand ce coq icy chantera
Le roi trouvé cy entera."

They took up their position on a hill in the neighbourhood of Cassel, but Philip had the wisdom not to attack them in this position. The patience of the Flemings was worn down by the ravaging of their lands and when they descended from their post of vantage the knights slew 13,000 of them.

Never, since the days of Charles the Great, had a French king appeared to be so powerful. Direct master of three-fourths of his kingdom, overlord, on account of the fiefs which they held in France, of the Kings of Majorca, Navarre, and England; allied with the Kings of Bohemia and Scotland; related by blood to the Kings of Naples and Hungary; protector of the pope, whom he held in quasi-captivity at Avignon, Philip IV. extended his

influence far and wide and thought of displaying himself as the head of Christendom, as the leader of European chivalry, in a new and final crusade. It was while affairs were in this state, while his magnificent and knightly court was absorbed in dreams of glory and pleasure, while his land, already accustomed to despotism, saw peace and order leading to an increase of industry and commerce, that there occurred the unhappy war which hurled France back into anarchy for more than a hundred years.

Causes of the Hundred Years' War: Claim of Edward III. Edward III. sighed for that fair crown of France, to which he seemed to be entitled by birth. Circumstances had compelled him in 1328 to recognise Philip of Valois, but circumstances change, and by 1336 they had done so. Philip was well aware of Edward's covert ambition and did not fail to attempt to increase the difficulties of his potential rival, aiding the Scots in war against England. But Edward defeated Scotland and determined to assist the first enemy who might rise against France, as Philip had assisted the foes of England. When Robert of Artois, accused of having attempted the life of the king, fled to England, he was at once welcomed.

Robert of Artois (1330).—Robert of Artois was a prince of the blood, one of the princes of the lilies. He had claims to the county of Artois, which was held first by his aunt and then by her daughters. In order to make good his claim he forged some documents and bribed false witnesses. The case, during which this crime was discovered, led to another. Robert had probably poisoned his aunt and the eldest of his cousins. A decree of the court of peers condemned him to the loss of his property and to perpetual banishment (1332). He retired to Brabant, and, to revenge himself, practised black arts against the king's son. According to the belief of the Middle Ages it was possible to kill any one by securing some sorcerer to make his image in wax, this image being baptised and then, after a mass and a religious consecration, left to melt in the sun or stabbed to the heart with a needle, when the person whom it represented died slowly, but not less surely, from the wound. Robert's conduct was discovered. Alarmed at the prospect of a prosecution for sorcery, he felt that he was too near France, and therefore fled to England, where he exerted himself to urge Edward III. into war (1336).

Affairs of Flanders : Artevelde: Naval Battle of Sluys (1340).—Edward had another reason for taking up arms. The Flemings were at that time the most industrious, the richest, and the freest people in Europe. Count Louis de Nevers of Flanders,

always in need of money, infringed the privileges of the burghers to procure it and punished all resistance with cruelty. The cloth of Flanders was made from English wool, and hence, if the count was pro-French by temperament, his people were pro-English from interest. In 1336 they expelled Louis, and their popular leader, Artevelde, at once demanded the support of Edward III., giving him the disastrous advice that he should claim the throne of France in order to remove the possible scruples of the Flemings, who might have hesitated to fight their suzerain, but who hesitated no longer when their assumption of arms was thus cloaked by a pretence of legitimacy.

The war began in 1337 on the side of Flanders and languished for many years. The French, defeated in a naval battle at Sluys, owing to the inexperience of their admirals who had never seen the sea, were victorious at St. Omer, Edward being checked at the siege of Tournai. For some time, a truce secured a cessation of hostilities.

Affairs of Brittany (1341–1343): Countess Jeanne de Montfort. —In 1341 hostilities were resumed in Brittany, where the two kings supported rival candidates for the ducal throne. Duke John III. died leaving no children. The question arose as to whether the duchy should pass to Jeanne de Penthièvre, wife of Charles of Blois and daughter of the eldest brother of the late duke, or to the late duke's youngest brother, John de Montfort, who had survived him. The two claimants put forward Mosaic Law, the rescripts of the Roman emperors, and Salic Law and custom. The lawyers discussed the documents; political considerations decided the issue. Charles of Blois was Philip VI.'s nephew; if he succeeded, the duchy would come into closer dependence on the French crown, and a decree of the parliament was given in his favour. John de Montfort hastened to England, promised to recognise Edward as King of France and to hold Brittany as a fief from him, provided that the king engaged to aid him and to defend him as his man and vassal with all his power. Thus began one of those wars full of "meetings, fair attacks, fair repulses, bright feats of arms, and grand deeds of valour," of which Froissart tells the story with grace and charm, but which were for the people an appalling calamity. Charles of Blois, supported by a large French army, including even the king's son, at first besieged his rival in the city of Nantes. Thirty Breton knights were taken in a neighbouring château. Charles of Blois, despite his piety, which secured for him the reputation of a saint, and Duke John, despite the fact that he

was later surnamed the Good, caused these prisoners to be decapitated and their heads to be hurled by catapults into the town. The terrified burghers capitulated, and John de Montfort was imprisoned in the Louvre at Paris.

" Countess Jeanne de Montfort was in the city of Rennes when she heard that her husband was taken ; though she was filled with great grief, she bravely rallied her friends and adherents, and showed them her little son, named John after his father, saying to them, ' Ah, lords, do not mourn for your master whom we have lost ; he was only one man. See, here is my son, who, God willing, shall be his father's avenger and who shall do great things for you. I have enough ; I will give him to you and you will have a captain such as shall lead you to victory.' After this, she went from Rennes to all the fortresses and chief towns, taking her young son with her, reviving the spirit of her men and reinforcing the garrisons with men and all things needful, till she came to Hennebon, where she passed all the winter. She had chosen that place, on the Blavet, near the sea, that she might be able to be in touch with England." (Froissart.)

" So when the spring returned many lords and a great crowd of men-at-arms joined Charles of Blois at Nantes and formed the siege of Rennes. The city was taken after having defended itself valiantly against many assaults, and the French advanced on Hennebon and besieged it vigorously. They had twelve engines which hurled vast stones on the city and great pieces of rock. The countess, fully armed and mounted on a fair charger, rode through the streets of the place, and called on her people to defend themselves boldly. She made the women, married and unmarried, prepare weapons and carry stones to the engines to hurl at her enemies, with bombs and fire-pots."

" The Countess of Montfort made a bold throw. She ascended a tower, to see better how her men fought. She looked and saw those of the host, lords and others, who had left their posts to see the assault ; she mounted on horseback with three hundred men-at-arms, and going out by a gate which was not attacked, she hurled herself very bravely on the tents and posts of these lords and burned them. When the lords saw their tents burning and heard the cries which came from them, they were all alarmed and ran back crying, ' Treason, treason.' The countess then gathered all her men together and saw that she could not regain the town without too great loss ; she went by another road and came to the château of Auray, three or four leagues from Hennebon. For five days the garrison of Hennebon was

alarmed and filled with great doubt, not knowing what had befallen the countess; but on the sixth night she, having gathered 500 companions well armed and mounted, left Auray and came at sunrise and rode to one of the flanks of the host and caused the gate of Hennebon to be opened and entered the place to the great joy of her people and to the sound of many trumpets and timbrels." Help from England caused the raising of the siege; the traitor Robert of Artois fell about this time in a skirmish near Vannes.

Little by little, the two kings found themselves engaged in hostilities. In 1342 Edward III. appeared in person in Brittany and undertook the sieges of Vannes, Rennes, and Nantes. On the other side, Duke John of Normandy assembled an army which included a vast number of barons and more than 40,000 soldiers. The two hosts met near Malestroit. The English, outnumbered four to one by their enemies, had taken care to occupy a strong position. It was midwinter; both sides were short of provisions; icy rains flooded the two camps and increased the sickness in the armies. The papal legates intervened and (January 19, 1343) secured the acceptance of a truce which was to last until Michaelmas, 1346.

Expedition of Edward III. into France.—Some time afterwards, Oliver de Clisson and fourteen Breton knights, who had sworn fealty to the King of England, were invited by Philip VI. to a great tournament at Paris; they were at once arrested and executed without formal trial. Edward made himself their avenger, and prepared a considerable army. The question arose as to the best point to land. In Brittany the French party had regained the ascendancy; Guienne was distant, the king's son held the frontier with a strong army, and a tragedy had closed Flanders to the English. Artevelde, Edward's godfather, as he was called, wished to hand over the land to the English; the Prince of Wales, Edward's eldest son, was to reign in Flanders. But the Flemings wished no more to belong to the King of England than to the King of France, and Artevelde was murdered in his house by the very people who had idolised him. The English fleet was sailing towards the mouth of the Gironde when a storm drove it back in the Channel. A new traitor, Geoffrey of Harcourt, advised a landing in Normandy, promising the support of his vassals and of the whole province. The king landed with 32,000 men (July 12, 1346) at La Hougue St. Vast in the Cotentin. He captured Barfleur, Cherbourg, Valogne, and St. Lô without difficulty. On July 26 he was under the walls of

Caen, "a town larger than any in England except London." The burghers boldly attacked him. "When," says Froissart, "the burghers saw the English advancing, coming forward in three battles in close order, and saw the pennants and banners fluttering in the wind, and heard the cries of the archers, things which they had never beheld or heard, they were so terrified and discomforted that nothing could stay their flight." The English entered the town with the fugitives, killing on all sides, giving no quarter. But the burghers regained their courage and defended themselves in their houses; more than five hundred English were killed or wounded when Edward caused the battle to cease by promising to spare the lives of the inhabitants. The town of Louviers, which was already "great, wealthy, and a commercial centre," was next taken. An attempt on Rouen was checked; Edward advanced up the left bank of the Seine and burned Pont de l'Arche, Vernon, Poissy, and St. Germain. His scouts came in sight of Paris and burned Bourg la Reine and St. Cloud.

But Philip had assembled a large army and advanced against the English. Edward restored the bridge of Poissy and, having crossed the Seine there, retired towards Ponthieu, his inheritance, in order that he might have a secure position behind the Somme. Philip had caused all the fords over this river to be fortified and guarded. At Blanquetaque he had placed 1000 men-at-arms and 5000 Genoese archers. Edward forced the passage, but realising that he could retreat no farther, halted and (August 26) drew up his army in battle array on the edge of some rising ground near Crecy, having placed his men in good order and having disposed his forces with skill.

Battle of Crecy (1346).—Philip advanced from Abbeville to engage the enemy at daybreak, the English being five leagues distant. A heavy rain pursued his army during the whole march. Four knights sent to reconnoitre the English position reported what they had discovered and advised the king to give his forces a night's rest. Philip ordered a halt. But the great nobles of France who commanded the various divisions of the army made it their pride to press on one before the other in order to be as near as possible to the English. "Neither the king nor the marshals had any control over their men, for there was a crowd of great lords and each wished to show his power. They rode forward without order and without plan, and thus found themselves in the presence of the enemy. As soon as the English saw the French coming near, they drew themselves up in array with-

out any haste, and ranged their battles. When King Philip came to the place where the English were drawn up in battle array, his blood boiled, for he hated them, and he cried to his marshals, 'Order the Genoese to advance and engage, in the name of God and St. Denis.'"

The rain, which had not ceased to fall, had rendered the bows of the Genoese unfit for use. Therefore, when they were ordered to attack, "they were much distressed and wearied since they had marched on foot that day more than six leagues, fully armed, and carrying their cross-bows; and they answered their officers that they were not in a condition to perform any great feats of arms. When the Count of Alençon heard this, he was enraged and cried, 'Ride down this rabble which fails in its duty.' Despite their arguments, and though the day was far advanced, the Genoese were again ordered to attack, which they did with much resolution. But the English, who awaited them in silence, and who, while the rain was falling, had kept their bowstrings covered under their doublets, let a shower of arrows fall on them. Edward had placed bombardiers among his archers who threw small lighted balls of fire in order to frighten and destroy the horses; these bombs caused such fear and noise that it seemed as if God was thundering, and a great destruction of men and horses was caused. The Genoese lost heart and slowly retreated, but a barrier of armed Frenchmen, mounted and richly equipped, barred their way. The King of France, when their poor display was seen and their defeat became clear, gave orders that "all the rabble should be killed, since they unreasonably bar our way."

The carrying out of this order naturally involved the loss of the battle, since a vast confusion resulted from which the English profited. The old King John of Bohemia, who, though blind, was fully armed, was held on his horse by two knights in the midst of his forces. When he heard that the battle had begun, he said to his attendants, "I ask you and specially order you to lead me forward so that I may strike a blow with my sword." His knights tied their horses to his and together they rode into the midst of their enemies, where all three were slain.

The French princes, who had lost the battle by their rashness, paid bravely for their error with their lives. They cut their way through the first ranks of the English, which were composed of archers, and attacked the lines of men-at-arms commanded by the Prince of Wales. For a moment the effort of the French appeared to be so formidable that Edward was begged to advance

with the third division to the help of his son, but the king, who formed an accurate estimate of the course of the battle from the windmill in which he was stationed, would not engage his reserves, and replied that the boy should be left to win his spurs, that he might have the honour of the victory. The cannon, which were first employed in a pitched battle upon this occasion, caused more alarm than damage, but the arrows of the English archers and the spears of the men-at-arms laid low a number of knights, who, on their frightened horses, attacked without order an army which was well posted and arranged. Philip of Valois, whose horse was killed under him, displayed marked courage; he was at last persuaded to abandon the field. Late at night he arrived before the château of Broye. "Open, open," he cried, knocking at the gate, "it is the unhappy King of France." In like circumstances Francis I. is said to have uttered words, more proud if not more true, "All is lost, save honour."

France had never suffered so terrible a defeat. Eleven princes, eighty barons, 1200 knights, and 30,000 soldiers were left dead on the field, without including two detachments of mercenaries who fell into the hands of the English on the following day and were equally destroyed.

Siege of Calais: Eustace de St. Pierre (1347).—Instead of penetrating farther into France after this glorious victory, Edward III. continued his retreat, since he had nowhere where he might recruit his forces and no port at which he might receive reinforcements from England. He led his army to Calais, the siege of which place he undertook (September 3, 1346). The town was strongly fortified, and the king realised that he could not breach the walls, but he determined to reduce the place by famine, for which purpose he resolved to spend the winter there. Round Calais he caused rather a second town than a camp to be constructed, and the English were housed in excellent wooden huts, fully provisioned, in which they recovered from the fatigues of their campaign without abandoning it. Philip, with the languor of despair, gathered a new army at Amiens. It was not ready until July, 1347, and then, as he found all ways of approach to be either impracticable or occupied by the enemy, his forces withdrew and were disbanded, after having shown their banners in the distance to the unhappy defenders of Calais, already reduced to the last extremities of hunger. When their provisions were entirely exhausted, the citizens implored the mercy of the English king; Edward at first demanded the unconditional surrender of the whole population, but afterwards

required that six burghers should come out in their shirts, with halters round their necks, bearing to him the keys of the town and castle and placing themselves at his mercy.

When John de Vienne returned to Calais with Edward's reply the town bell was rung to gather every one in the town hall. At the sound men and women gathered, eager to hear the news, though they were so worn with hunger that they could not stand. When they heard the answer, all began to cry and weep that there was so hard and pitiless a heart in the world. Presently there arose Eustace de St. Pierre, the richest of the burghers, and said before them all, "My lords, it would be grievous and pitiable to permit such men as are here to die of hunger or in any other way, if a remedy can be found, and great thanks and gratitude towards Our Lord would be due were so great an evil avoided. I have great hope that I shall find grace and pardon with the Lord if I die to save this people, and therefore I would be the first, and willingly put myself forward, to go barefoot and with a halter round my neck, and to place myself at the mercy of the King of England." When Eustace de St. Pierre spoke thus all reverenced his self-sacrifice, and many men and women threw themselves at his feet weeping tenderly. Next another burgher, prominent and great, who had two fair daughters, rose and said that he would be a companion to his fellow, Eustace de St. Pierre; this was Sieur Jean d'Aire. Then there followed a third, Sieur Jacques de Vissant, who was rich and possessed of much property, and who said that he would bear his two cousins company, as did Pierre de Vissant, his brother, and then a fifth and a sixth. Edward, surrounded by all his barons, awaited them at the place where he lodged. "Sire," said Walter de Mauny to him, "here are the representatives of the city of Calais at your orders." Edward drew himself up stiffly and looked at them coldly, for he hated the citizens of Calais on account of the great damage which in the past they had done to his realm by sea. The six burghers fell on their knees before him and with joined hands cried, "Gentle sire and gentle king, see here these six who have been notable citizens of Calais and great merchants; we bring you the keys of the town and castle of Calais and surrender ourselves at your mercy and place ourselves at your absolute disposal to save the people of Calais, who have suffered much from sorrow. Have pity on us and mercy for your great nobility." There was not a noble or brave man who was not moved to tears, but the king regarded them with much anger, for his heart was hard and he was so filled

with wrath that he could not speak, and when he did speak, it was to order them to be beheaded. All his barons and knights prayed for their pardon, as such an act would show the king to be without pity or mercy, but they could not move Edward. Sir Walter de Mauny spoke in his turn for them all; the king ground his teeth and cried, "Let them be beheaded." Then the Queen of England, all humbly, being far advanced in pregnancy, and weeping from the sorrow which she could not restrain, fell on her knees before the king, and said, "Gentle sire, since after great peril I crossed the sea, as you know, I have asked no favour from you. Now I ask humbly for a gift to me, for the Son of the Blessed Mary, and for the love that you bear me, that you give me the lives of these six men." The king heard her and looked very tenderly at the wife whom he loved, as she wept, and his heart melted, and he answered, "I love you too dearly to do otherwise than as you ask. You pray me so that I know not how to refuse, and though it pains me, take them, I give them to you, do with them what you will." The good queen gave him many thanks. Then she rose and caused the six burghers to rise also, took them into her chamber, clothed them and fed them, and then sent them in safety out of the army. It must be added that Edward kept John de Vienne and all the knights who had taken part in the defence of the place in prison, and that he ordered all the inhabitants to leave Calais, which was repeopled by Englishmen.

The two opponents were equally weary of war when Pope Clement VI. offered his mediation, which both desired. The two kings signed for themselves and their allies a truce which was to last ten months and which left each in possession of that which he held (September 28, 1347).

The Black Death (1348).—To the misfortunes of war a still more disastrous calamity was now added. The Black Death, after having devastated a great part of Europe, reached France. "In many places," says the continuator of Nangis, "of twenty men two only remained alive, and in the Hôtel Dieu at Paris the death-roll was such that for some time five hundred corpses were borne each day in carts to the cemetery of the Innocents." The people accused the Jews of having poisoned the wells and fountains, attacked them in many places and put them to death without the government being able to prevent them. The Black Death is said to have carried off a third of the population of Europe, and at Paris, according to a report sent to Pope Clement VI., 80,000 persons died. As a sanitary precaution, Philip VI.

issued an ordinance against blasphemers, ordering that for each offence men should lose first a lip, then the other lip, and finally the tongue.

Internal Administration: The Gabelle.—To the reign of Philip VI. must be traced the origin of a tax, the *gabelle*, which remained odious during the whole period of the old monarchy. An ordinance (1343) established that no one might sell salt in France except such as had been bought from the king's stores. Such stores, or *gabelles*, were established in various places; all the salt produced was brought there and sold at a price which the king fixed, as a result of which he won the anger and disfavour of the people, great and small. The duties on exports were increased, and another tax, ruinous for trade, was levied on all goods sold within the realm and on the town markets. These innovations were reminiscent of the Roman Empire. The Justinian Code was then widely studied, and Jean Fabvier, the father of French law, published his commentaries on the *Institutes* and the *Code* (1338).

If in these laws, made for and by absolute monarchs, the lawyers found means of arming the French kings with powers which they had not before possessed, the ministers found in the institutions of the Roman Empire means of securing for the treasury resources which the Middle Ages had been unable to supply. The king's advisers, in the attack which they made upon privilege, showed no more respect for the immunities of the clergy than for those of the nobles and of the commons. Under Philip VI., *l'appel comme d'abus* was introduced, which allowed an appeal to the king from episcopal sentences and recourse to him in cases of abuses committed by clerks, and thus reminded the clergy that, though they were priests, they were also citizens and subjects.

In 1338 an assembly of the States-General made the following decree: "The king shall levy no extraordinary taxes from the people without the assent of the three estates, and they shall take solemn oath to this effect." This was the proclamation of the great principle that the people should pay no taxes to which their representatives had not assented. Philip VI. escaped the effect of this ordinance by frequently debasing the coinage. In 1342, the value of money changed almost every week, with disastrous results for commerce. Philip also secured for himself alone, under the name of regalian rights, the dues received by patrons of churches from vacant benefices.

Acquisition of Montpellier and Dauphiné.—One of the last

acts of Philip VI. was the important acquisition of the province which later received the name of Dauphiné. Humbert II., Count of Vienne, called Dauphin of Vienne, because his family bore a dolphin in its arms, sold his estates to Philip VI. for 120,000 florins (1349). From this time the eldest son of the King of France bore the title of dauphin. This acquisition was of the greatest importance since the new province protected Lyons and enabled France at last to reach the Alps. The annexation of Provence now became a mere question of time. Montpellier was bought in this reign from the King of Majorca.

Employment of Cannon in War.—At the time when the kings attained to absolute power, a monk produced an arm which would pierce the most tempered steel and overthrow the strongest walls. Roger Bacon, an English friar, who died during the reign of Philip the Fair, invented gunpowder, or at least revealed the secret of its composition, which had been long known in the East, and of which the Arabs in Spain had availed themselves as early as the thirteenth century. The first mention of its use in France is found in the register of the chamber of accounts at Paris for 1338, where there is a note of a sum paid for "powder and other things needed for the cannon which are before Puy-Guihem in Agénois." These cannon, formed of bands of iron strengthened by circles of iron, made more noise than damage. In a century there was not a town, not a fortress, which could defend its feudal independence against the king's cannon, and the least soldier, armed with an arquebus, could lay low the mightiest lord, despite his Milanese armour, which had hitherto been impenetrable. Equality revived on the battlefield, and when another discovery, that of printing, had been achieved, equality spread, with the assistance of the royal power, through civil society.

CHAPTER XXIX

JOHN THE GOOD (1350–1364)

King John.—The death of Philip of Valois, which occurred on August 22, 1350, made no change in the condition of the realm. John, who succeeded to the throne, was thirty-one years old and had long been employed in affairs of state. Like his father, he was impetuous and violent, brave and extravagant. During the first months after his accession he distributed among the

nobles the accumulations in the treasury, and when money was not forthcoming he granted remissions of payment for the debts which he had contracted. Money became still more scarce; to secure it the king had recourse to the most extraordinary methods, drawing up elaborate police regulations which brought in numberless fines; debasing the coinage to such an extent that its value was changed eighteen times in one year, and the silver mark in a few months rose in value from four livres to seventeen livres eight sous.

States-General of 1351: Charles the Bad.—Such curious expedients were far from sufficing for the needs of a prince who on one occasion, at a time of distress, gave 50,000 crowns to one of his knights. John dared to ask the nation for the money of which he was in need, and he convoked the States-General at Paris in 1351. No satisfactory account of what passed has been preserved. There were many complaints, some promises, and no reforms. The war continued in Brittany between the knights of the two parties, but the kings no longer intervened, even signing a renewal of the truce. But besides the two kings who disputed the throne of France, there was a third who had a better right to that throne than either of the others. Charles, King of Navarre, whose turbulence and intriguing disposition gained for him the epithet of "the Bad," was the son of the daughter of Louis X., and therefore, if the Salic Law were disregarded, was clearly the rightful heir to the crown. While waiting for the day when he might realise his hopes, he laid claim to Champagne and Angoumois, and when the latter was granted to the Constable de Lacerda, an intimate friend of the king, Charles caused him to be murdered. John retorted by seizing the Norman possessions of the King of Navarre, and Charles crossed to England.

New Expedition of Edward III. and the Black Prince to France (1355).—The English had collected so much booty during their first attack on France, gaining 40,000 pieces of cloth in the single town of Caen, that they were quite ready to renew the adventure. Edward invaded the country by way of Calais and ravaged Artois (1355), while his son, the Black Prince, attacked from Bordeaux and returned from an expedition against Languedoc with a thousand waggon-loads of booty. John did not offer a single battle to the invaders, but the expense of raising soldiers against them ruined him, and the treasury being empty the States-General were summoned to fill it.

States-General of 1355.—On this occasion the deputies showed

greater courage. Accustomed to order, economy, and probity in the administration of public affairs, they were angry at this wild extravagance which had invaded the finances of the state, and demanded reform with vigour. They sought the establishment of a fixed coinage, the abolition of the right of plunder by the officials of the king, who, under pretence of the service of his household, pillaged the farms during the journeys of the court and those around the royal residences. The States undertook to supply the king forthwith with 30,000 men-at-arms and five million Parisian livres, payable in one year. But, knowing that money which entered the royal coffers was soon spent, without anything being left for the defence of the realm, they demanded that the sums received should remain, till required, in the hands of receivers. These were appointed by the States and accountable to them alone, being obliged to prove that the whole amount raised had been used for the purposes of the war. The money was to be derived from a *gabelle* on salt and from an *aide* (tax) of eightpence in the pound on everything sold. These two taxes were common to all three orders ; even the king, the queen, and the princes of the blood undertook to pay them. In order to secure the loyal and prompt execution of these measures, the assembly appointed a commission of nine of its members to supervise the matter, and then adjourned to an appointed date.

This was nothing less than a revolution. To vote and to receive taxation, to regulate and supervise expenditure, is to exercise no inconsiderable portion of the sovereign power. The deputies of 1355 made the first step towards that distant goal which has hardly been reached in the constitutional monarchies of the present day.

Execution of the Count of Harcourt.—The idea of paying taxes annoyed the nobility ; another vigorous opponent of the scheme was the King of Navarre (who had returned to France as a result of a treaty with John), as was also the Count of Harcourt, his friend. At the news of his opposition John cried that he would have no master in France save himself, and one day, when the Dauphin Charles, then nineteen years of age, had invited the King of Navarre and his friends to a banquet, the king, who was aware of the time of the festivity, came to Rouen, surprised the party, and arrested Charles the Bad at his son's table. Despite the prayers and tears of the dauphin, who seemed to be guilty of having drawn his guests into an ambush, John threw Charles the Bad into prison, executed the Count of Harcourt and some others. Such summary justice was to the king's taste ; at the

beginning of his reign he had caused the Constable Raoul de Nesle to be beheaded in the very courtyard of his palace. He was charged with having relations with the English. Some months after the arrest of the King of Navarre, John was himself a captive.

Battle of Poitiers (1356) : Captivity of the King.—John laid siege to the little town of Breteuil, which belonged to the King of Navarre, and while engaged on this operation learned that the Prince of Wales had again taken the field with 20,000 men-at-arms and 6000 archers, had crossed the Garonne and Dordogne, ravaged Rouergue, Auvergne, Limousin, and Berry. The Black Prince, burning everything as he advanced, reached the little village of Romorantin. The town opened its gates at the first summons, but the castle was defended by three brave knights, who would not surrender despite the poor character of their fortress. The Prince of Wales, irritated at having lost a knight of whom he was fond before this insignificant place, swore that he would not leave it until he had reduced it. The castle eventually surrendered, but the obstinacy of its defenders placed the English army in a position of extreme difficulty.

The King of France had meanwhile crossed the Loire and had reached Poitiers before the English army, the communications of which with Bordeaux were thus cut. The Black Prince, approaching the city, took up his position on the summit of a steep incline, which was thickly planted with vines and cut up by hedges and bushes. The place was called the field of Maupertuis and lay near Beauvoir, two leagues north of Poitiers. The Black Prince fortified his position with palisades and ditches, using his waggons as a wall where the ground was most open. It was impossible to reach the summit of the incline except by a lane, along which three knights could hardly ride abreast. The prince posted archers along the hedges beside this road, dismounted his men-at-arms, placed them on the summit, and concealed the remainder of his archers among the vines.

John commanded one of the most brilliant armies which had yet been raised in France. He had under his orders, besides his four sons, twenty-six dukes and counts, 140 knights-banneret, and some 50,000 soldiers, the majority of whom were knights in steel armour. He had only to decline to attack and the English would have been reduced by hunger ; he resolved, however, to avenge the disgrace of Crecy, and instead incurred a disgrace equal to that of his father (September 19, 1356).

The two Marshals of France, Arnold d'Audeneham and John

of Clermont, at the head of 300 chosen knights, instead of turning the enemy's flank and thus reducing their strong position, advanced through the narrow garden which led to the hill. Their horses were pierced again and again by the arrows which rained on them from the hedges; pain maddened them; they reared and threw their riders. In a few minutes the whole force was defeated, as the English infantry issued from their hiding-places and cut the thoats of those who had been dismounted. The fugitives pressed back on the body commanded by the dauphin and spread disorder and panic in its ranks. The Prince of Wales seized the moment to charge with the 600 men-at-arms whom he had kept in reserve, to the cry of "St. George and Guienne!" and fell on the flank of the disordered column; he cut his way through it and dispersed it. The princes of France, terrified at the confusion, fled, headed by the dauphin, and carried away with them more than 800 lances, who acted as their escort. The second column, commanded by the Duke of Orleans, followed this example.

Two-thirds of the French army was already routed without having engaged the enemy. The third division, commanded by the king, was twice as numerous as the whole English army. But John had made the mistake of causing his men to dismount, and this manœuvre, which was right in the case of the English who were placed among the vines and hedges on the hill, was disastrous for the French who were fighting on open ground. The Prince of Wales caused his men-at-arms to remount, and when his 2000 knights debouched into the plain, no force of infantry was able to resist the weight of these heavy cavalry, clothed in steel. The king was brave; he placed himself at the head of his men, battle-axe in hand, and laid low a number of the enemy. "He performed miracles, holding his axe with which he defended himself, he attacked his foes." His youngest son, Philip the Bold, remained with him despite the flight of his elder brothers, and at each new attack cried to the king, "Father, guard your right; father, guard your left!" The whole battle raged round the person of the king; the bravest English knights vied in their efforts to secure so rich a prize. He at last surrendered to a gentleman of Artois.

The action, which had begun at dawn, ended at mid-day. The French left 11,000 dead on the field of battle. The English, who had only lost 2500, took as prisoners thirteen counts, one archbishop, seventy barons, and 2000 men-at-arms, without including the prisoners of lesser importance; they soon found that their

captives were twice as numerous as themselves. The guarding of so large a number caused them some uneasiness, and they therefore hastened to release the majority on payment of ransom and on parole. The prisoners undertook to come to Bordeaux at Christmas with the stipulated sum or to return to captivity. As for the chief captive, the Prince of Wales held him too important to be insulted ; he was treated with respect, the prince waiting on him at supper and only sitting at the king's table to receive his orders. Being eager to place his vast booty and his prisoners in a place of safety, the Black Prince returned at once to Bordeaux and thence to London.

States-General of 1356 and 1357: Etienne Marcel.—The news of this disaster roused consternation and anger in the whole kingdom, since having suffered the shame of such a defeat, the land had also to suffer its terrible results. As soon as those captured at Poitiers were released on parole, they devoted themselves to compelling their vassals and subjects to raise the amount of their ransoms.

Unrest was already great when the Dauphin Charles, Duke of Normandy, appeared at Paris ten days after the battle. He took the title of lieutenant of the King of France and assembled the States, which opened their second session on October 17. The assembly was composed of nearly 800 persons ; the third estate alone numbered 400 deputies, among whom the most active and able was the provost of the merchants of Paris, Etienne Marcel. The bourgeoisie, irritated by the incompetence of the royal government, took its place and attempted to retain it. The deputies demanded the release of the King of Navarre, who had been taken in an ambush, and the establishment of a council of four prelates, twelve knights, and twelve burghers, selected from the States, who were to assist the prince in the administration of the kingdom. The dauphin in alarm adjourned the assembly. But the treasury was empty ; he was forced to recall the assembly (February 5, 1357). The provost, Etienne Marcel, and the Bishop of Laon, Robert Le Coq, then presented the list of grievances which had been drawn up in the first session and demanded that this list should be made known to the States of each province. This communication was accomplished with extraordinary speed, and in a month's time the lists were returned, fortified in a measure by the assent of the nation. On March 3, the dauphin called a general meeting at the palace, when the Bishop of Laon acted as spokesman of the assembly. He required the prince to dismiss twenty-two of his advisers

and servants who were charged with embezzlement and to offer effective guarantees against renewed abuses. Of these guarantees, the most important was that the States should be permitted to meet twice a year, without any further summons, in order to assure themselves that the laws were observed; that they should be allowed to nominate 36 commissioners, twelve from each order, who were to assist the dauphin in the defence of the realm when the States were not sitting. Other elected deputies were to be sent into the provinces with almost unlimited powers, to receive the taxes, pay the royal officials, assemble the provincial States, and perform other duties. On these terms, the States offered a subsidy sufficient for the raising and maintenance of 30,000 men, though they reserved to their own officers the right to hold and expend the money granted. After the bishop had spoken, John de Picquigny, in the name of the nobles, an advocate of Abbeville in the name of the commons, and Etienne Marcel in the name of the burghers of Paris, declared their agreement with his speech.

Great Ordinance of 1357.—Such agreement between the orders rendered all resistance hopeless, and the great ordinance of March, 1357, consisting of sixty-one articles, conceded the demands of the States. The chief points in this document were as follows :—

Government.—The States-General were to meet regularly twice a year at fixed times, and in the intervals between their sessions, a council of thirty-six, chosen by the States, were to aid the prince in the administration of the kingdom. Other elected representatives were to be sent into the provinces with almost unlimited powers and were especially instructed to punish negligent or dishonest officials and to assemble and consult the provincial States.

Finance.—Taxes were to be voted and raised by the States themselves, who should supervise the expenditure of the money raised; the coinage circulating in the kingdom was in future to be invariable.

Army.—Every man in France was to be armed; the nobles were forbidden to fight among themselves or to leave the realm; the soldiers should only be paid by the States.

Justice.—There had been a case which lasted for twenty years and the cost of justice was enormous. The ordinance ordered judges to attend the parliament every day at dawn, to hasten the conclusion of pending suits, and to spare expense as much as possible.

Abuses.—The right of the king to take goods during his travels in the kingdom, which meant a thousand abuses, was abolished. Burghers were empowered to resist the right of plunder, and all alienation of the royal demesne was explicitly forbidden.

In the main these measures were excellent, but political reform, in the face of the victorious English, was dangerous. Moreover, this reforming ordinance, the work of a few deputies in advance of their time, did not represent the work, the opinion, or the wish of France, and when Paris was forced to arm in order to defend and to maintain the work of the States-General, the city stood alone, and no one came to the help of the Parisians.

Murder of the Ministers of the Dauphin (1358).—It was impossible to expect that the monarchy, which had enjoyed absolute power for half a century, would consent to abdicate. As early as April 6, the dauphin, by order of his father, forbade all the subjects of the kingdom to pay the tax which the States had decreed a month earlier. On April 8, he revoked this order, but a few days later he declared that he was resolved to rule alone and not to be in tutelage. On February 22, 1358, he broke a promise, the fulfilment of which was a matter of deep interest to the burghers, and effected a debasement of the coinage by ordinance. Open hostility forthwith appeared at Paris and the burghers gave way to violence, a fault by which the best causes have been ruined. On the day after the issue of the ordinance, the provost of the merchants assembled all the guilds in arms, advanced with them to the dauphin's palace, entered his chamber, and demanded that he should at once devote himself to the defence of the realm which he had inherited and protect the people whom he had abandoned to the rapine of the soldiery. "If I had the means, I would do so willingly," answered Charles, "but those who possess the powers and revenues of the state should also defend it." Other bitter remarks were exchanged, and finally Marcel cried, "Sire, do not be offended at what you see; it must be so." Then, turning to some of those who had come with him, he said, "Do quickly that which we came to do." Thereupon they laid hands on the Marshal of Champagne and the Marshal of Normandy, the dauphin's chief advisers, and killed them so near the prince that his robe was stained with their blood. Charles, in alarm, prayed Marcel to spare him. The provost assured him that he was in no danger, but placed on his head the red and blue cap, the colours of Paris, and himself donned the cap of the prince which he wore throughout the day. Marcel next proceeded to give an account of his proceedings

against the two marshals, "evil traitors," to the populace assembled on the Place de Grève. He spoke from the balcony of the Hôtel de Ville, and the people cried in answer, "We avow the deed and will sustain you." Returning to the palace, he found the dauphin filled with alarm and grief, and said to him, "My lord, do not grieve, for that which has been done has been done by the will of the people." He should have added that it had been done by a minority of the people, of the burghers of Paris, who prepared to enter into conflict with the rest of the nation.

The Nobles arm against Paris.—As a matter of fact, the deputies of the nobles and the majority of the deputies of the clergy had already left the assembly, which only represented the towns which were under the influence of the deputies and municipal council of Paris. After the murder of the two marshals, the nobles showed a strong irritation against those burghers who aspired to control the whole state and whose hands were stained with noble blood. The dauphin having gone to hold the states of Champagne at Provins, the Count de Braine asked him if the Marshal of Champagne had deserved death by any crime which he had committed. Charles answered that the two marshals had always served him well and loyally. The count then fell on his knees and prayed for justice for so atrocious a crime. At the states of Vermandois, held at Compiègne, the nobles offered Charles their services against the rebels of Paris.

This offer was a declaration of war, and civil war began. The dauphin assembled 7000 lances, with whom he lived at free quarters on the land, occupying in turn Meaux, Melun, St. Maur, the bridge of Charenton, and arresting all who came from the upper Seine and Marne. Marcel, on his side, captured the castle of the Louvre, repaired and completed the walls of Paris, dug a trench, placed catapults and cannon on the fortifications, prepared chains which could be instantly drawn across the streets, and hired mercenaries.

The Jacquerie[1] **(1358).**—While the nobles attacked the burghers, the peasants also rose. Upon them especially fell the burden of the evils of the time, for while the towns and castles had nothing to fear from brigands, the villages were the prey of every chief of a robber band. When the enemy plundered, friendly troops pillaged what was left in order to live; if anything yet remained the nobles took that. The barons had to fortify and provision their castles; they had to find pay for their men, to recoup

[1] Revolted peasantry.

themselves for the losses which they had sustained in the war, and to pay their own ransom or the ransom of some friend or relative. They seized the movables, crops, beasts, and implements of the peasants, and ruined the French people to enrich the English, whom they had failed to conquer though outnumbering them ten to one. The peasants, who had in the past been indifferent to the general affairs of the state, began to realise that great battles were fought and lost at their expense.

Following on the exactions of the lords, came those of the soldiery, who were thrown out of work by the cessation of hostilities, but were not ready to abandon so lucrative a calling. Such mercenary leaders, the Welshman Griffiths, the Englishman Robert Knollys, the Frenchman Arnaud de Cervoles, of the great family of Talleyrand-Périgord (surnamed the Archpriest because he held a benefice); Baron Fulk de Laval, Le Hennuyer, Eustace d'Aubrecicourt, and the Germans, Albrecht and Frank Hennekin, held burghers and peasants to ransom, as well as monasteries and churches.

When the peasants learned that the burghers had taken up arms against the nobles, they believed that the time had come for them to avenge their sufferings. They armed themselves, assembled in bands, and attacked the castles. The peasants of Beauvais gave the signal, and the most terrible scenes followed. They spared neither age nor sex, tortured their prisoners, outraged the noblest women, burned little children alive, and left nothing but blood and ashes where they had passed. In Champagne and Picardy alone they numbered more than 100,000, and fancied that they would easily account for the nobles, but the latter, who had at first been taken by surprise, gathered together and a horrible, pitiless war ensued.

Marcel was in too great difficulties to despise any allies who offered themselves. He realised that the burghers alone could not accomplish a revolution, and entered into relations with the Jacquerie. When they advanced on Meaux, where the families of the nobles had taken refuge, he sent two companies of burgher militia to their help, and the inhabitants of the town also made common cause with the peasants. The union of the people of the towns and of the rural districts thus began. Unhappily too much blood had been shed on the path that they travelled together for them to attain their object. Meaux made a successful defence; the Jacquerie were defeated (June 9), tracked to their hiding-places, and exterminated. For some weeks there was a terrible massacre. The sad memory of this horror has

passed down through the ages, and the Jacquerie have remained synonymous with the savage foes of all civilised society.

Marcel allies with Charles the Bad.—Marcel had relied on the peasants, and they had been hanged, burned, and tracked down like wild beasts. He relied also on a noble, a prince, hoping to gain through him a party among the nobles and to obtain cavalry and armed knights to oppose to those of the dauphin. His ally was the King of Navarre, whom he had delivered from prison; Marcel secured for him the grant of the title of captain from the city of Paris (June 15). The new ally often permitted that contempt for the common herd, which he shared with all the nobles, to appear in his speech. He had quite recently massacred in a single fight 3000 of the peasants, and had crowned with a tripod of red-hot iron the leader of this band of Jacquerie, William Caillet. Horrible as the war had been, the burghers felt that there was a certain community of interest between them and the peasants, that the destroyer of one could hardly be the sincere friend of the other. Marcel had chosen a dangerous ally.

Treason of Charles the Bad.—The dauphin advanced on the side of Charenton and St. Maur and reached a point from which he threatened the gate of St. Antoine (July 8, 1358). Marcel asked the King of Navarre to repulse the enemy, but though he marched out of Paris, instead of attacking the dauphin he had a long interview with him and a treaty was concluded between them. The king was promised full satisfaction for all his complaints and 400,000 florins if he handed over the city and Marcel. News of these plans reached Paris; the cry of treason was raised, and the body of aldermen deprived Charles of his title of captain. He soon left the city and attacked the neighbouring district, pillaging and harrying with the dauphin.

Defeats of the Parisians.—The position of Marcel became critical. Provisions began to run short, but the burghers were not disheartened and wished to attack the forces of the King of Navarre. They issued from the city and marched all day towards the district of St. Cloud. Meeting no one, they returned, carrying their steel helmets either in their hands or round their necks, while others from weariness trailed their spears or carried them in their slings. Suddenly 400 men, ambushed on their route, appeared and attacked them; the burghers fled hastily, but 700 held their ground, calling upon their leader who had retired among the first. Marcel gave them no help; he was in negotiation with the enemy.

Death of Marcel (1358).—The capable and adventurous pro-

vost, having attempted an impossible revolution, was driven to take a desperate course. The King of Navarre was his sole resource. In order to avoid revolution, Marcel was anxious to do what Mirabeau had attempted in 1789, what was done in 1830; he aimed not at changing either the government or the dynasty, but at replacing one reigning branch by another. He promised Charles the Bad that he would hand over the gate and bastille of St. Denis, which would enable the prince to make himself master of Paris, that he would put his opponents to death, their houses, if a contemporary account may be credited, having been marked beforehand, and probably that he would cause the prince to be proclaimed king. The execution of the plot was fixed for the night of July 31 to August 1. But one of the aldermen, Jean Maillart, on whom Marcel chiefly relied and whom he called his special friend, had gleaned his plans and defeated them by a counterplot. He entered into relations with Pepin des Essarts and Jean de Charny, the leaders of the dauphin's party, and "these three with their men came a little before midnight to the bastille of St. Denis, where they found Marcel with the keys of the gate in his hands. Jean Maillart was the first to speak, calling to Marcel by his name and crying, 'Stephen, Stephen, what are you doing at this hour?' The provost answered, 'John, I am here to take care of the city of which I have charge.' 'By God,' answered Maillart, 'this is not well; you are here at this hour for no good; and I show you,' he added to his companions, 'how he bears the keys of the gates in his hand to betray the city.' The provost advanced towards him and cried, 'You lie.' 'By God, it is you who lie,' said Maillart. Then he fell on Marcel and cried to his men, 'To the death, to the death. Every man to his post; they are traitors.' There was a great uproar; the provost would gladly have fled had he been able, but he could not, for he was pressed on all sides. Then Maillart struck him with an axe on the head and felled him to the ground, though he was his friend, nor did he leave him until he was dead and six of those who were with him. The survivors were taken and cast into prison."

The Dauphin Re-enters Paris.—The next day but one the dauphin re-entered Paris leaning on the arm of Jean Maillart. A burgher boldly advanced towards him and cried loudly, "Had my wish been fulfilled, you would not have entered the city; but little will be done for you here." The Count of Tancarville pointed his sword at the peasant, but the dauphin stayed his arm and contented himself with remarking, "You are little

believed, good sir." And the dauphin was right. His victory was complete; the King of Navarre himself made his peace, without stipulating for any personal advantage, declaring that he wished only to be a good Frenchman. Paris, after some executions had taken place, seemed once more to become the royal city, as docile as it had been in the past. But the memory remained of the time when the burghers had dared to speak face to face with their master of justice and good government. In 1413, and after the lapse of almost a century, at the States of 1484, an echo of the bold voices which demanded reform in 1356 was heard. The monarchy showed that it had received a warning; John and Charles V. abandoned the practice of debasing the coinage, and the latter attempted to render the States-General innocuous by introducing some reforms and by ruling wisely.

Miserable Condition of the Kingdom.—The dauphin had returned to Paris, but the state of the kingdom appeared to be desperate. English or French brigand bands scoured the realm. The inhabitants of the country were forced to convert the bell-towers of their churches into forts. Sentinels were posted in them all day to announce the approach of the enemy while their comrades worked; at night all retired to camps built in the marshlands by the rivers, or fortified themselves, with their beasts, in subterranean fastnesses. In the midst of such terrors, industry fared ill; the harvest showed the effect, and famine threatened the land with another scourge.

Negotiations.—Peace discussions began. Weary of the magnificent hospitality with which he was entertained at Windsor, John treated with the English king. He abandoned to him the coast of the Channel, Calais, Montreuil, Boulogne, Ponthieu, and Normandy; the whole of Aquitaine, including Gascony, the Bordelais, Agenois, Quercy, Périgord, Limousin, Poitou, Saintonge, and Aunis; Touraine and Anjou; and he promised four million crowns as his personal ransom. In other words, he ceded half France and the mouths of all her rivers.

When this treaty was brought to Paris the dauphin refused to execute it. To gain support in his conflict with his father he assembled a mere shadow of an assembly of the three orders at Paris (May 19, 1359). It rejected the shameful convention, adding that King John "would have to remain in England and that God, when He saw fit, would provide a remedy."

Expedition of Edward III. to France (1359): New System of Warfare.—Five months later (October 28, 1359), Edward landed at Calais with his four sons, the chief nobles of his realm, 6000

mailed horsemen, 6000 waggons filled with munitions, kitchens, mills, forges, tents, and all that was needed to render life comfortable. He had also hawks and falcons for the chase, and wherries made of boiled leather for fishing in Lent. "He had so great a multitude of men that the whole land was covered; they were so richly armed and equipped that it was wonderful and delightful to see the glistening arms, waving banners, and the host in battle array slowly riding along. He had also five hundred varlets with stones and slings who went before the host and opened gates and roads, cutting down trees and bushes to make the passage easy."

The season of the year was unfavourable for the expedition. It rained incessantly. On November 30 the English arrived before Reims; the archbishop, John de Craon, closed the gates and valiantly repulsed all attacks. Edward had long before announced that he was determined to be consecrated there. Seven weeks were spent before the walls, and yet the city was not taken. Edward hoped every day that he would be attacked and gain another victory such as those of Crecy and Poitiers. Finally, as no French army appeared, he resumed his march slowly, and, without taking the shortest way, advanced across the district of Châlons to Bar-le-Duc, and across that of Troyes to Tonnerre, the Duke of Burgundy saving his lands from pillage by paying 200,000 crowns of gold. Finally Edward turned towards Paris and encamped two leagues from that city, at Bourg-la-Reine. The English heralds offered battle to the dauphin, who refused it. One of Edward's knights, Walter of Mauny, approached the ramparts to throw a lance at them; Charles strictly forbade his knights to leave the defences. He was resolved not to carry on war as the nobles had hitherto done.

Popular Resistance.—Thus the burghers safe in their towns, and the nobles in their castles, allowed the storm to pass by; it could not touch them behind their walls. All the misfortunes fell on the peasants, who did not dare even to defend themselves. They went into the fields only when they had posted a sentinel in their clock tower, who each day watched to sound the alarm when the robbers appeared in the distance. At night they took refuge in the marshes or in subterranean caves. But misery at last gave them courage; despair gave them strength. They faced these men clothed from head to foot in armour, before whom they had been used to tremble; in many places the foreign aggressor began to meet local resistance from the people more dangerous to them than the grand attacks of the feudal princes.

Edward himself grew weary. It is said that as the English king and his men rode, worn out and depressed, across the plain of Beauce, a terrible storm overtook them and that the king vowed by Notre-Dame of Chartres to devote all his energy to restoring peace between the two peoples. It was not a tempest that suddenly changed the king's mood; it was weariness of a war which never ended, and in which no glory was to be gained since no battles were fought; no more booty could be expected since everything had either been taken already or hidden in the innumerable fortresses with which France bristled.

Treaty of Bretigny (1360).—The dauphin was still more eager to remove the English from his land, since "France was in agony, and if her ill endured but a little, she would perish." Conferences were opened at Bretigny, near Chartres (May 1, 1360). The English envoys at first demanded the crown of France; then they reduced their claims to the inheritance of the Plantagenets. At last Edward agreed to content himself with the duchy of Aquitaine, with all its dependencies, Gascony, Poitou, Saintogne, Aunis, Agenois, Périgord, Limousin, Quercy, Rouergue, and Angoumois, which were to be ceded in full sovereignty, and Calais, with the counties of Ponthieu and Guines and the viscounty of Montreuil. The king's ransom was fixed at three million gold crowns. As a guarantee for this sum, John was to give Edward the choice of a certain number of hostages, drawn from the noblest lords and richest burghers of the kingdom. He took them with him across Normandy, on his way to embark at Honfleur, the Havre of the period. The provinces ceded to the English were handed over despite the protests of the majority of the inhabitants, most of whom cried with the men of La Rochelle, "We honour the English with our lips, but in our hearts we curse them." For a whole year that port refused to open its gates to the English.

At Abbeville the citizens distinguished themselves still more. When that patriotic city saw the soldiers riding in its streets who, for fifteen years, had trodden France under foot, and who knew not how to restrain themselves in the presence of those whom victory had handed over to them, plots were hatched, a riot ensued, and was suppressed. A rich burgher, Ringois, was taken. The English commandant showed moderation, and offered Ringois his liberty on the sole condition that he should swear fealty to Edward; the offer was refused. The burgher was carried to Dover and threatened with death if he continued obstinate; he persisted in his refusal. He was placed on a plat-

form of the fortress ; he was forced to mount the highest parapet, while the sea raged at the foot of the cliff. He had but to say a word to save his life ; he still refused, and the guards hurled him down. The Greeks and Romans did not allow the names of their bravest and most devoted sons to sink into oblivion ; in France to-day the name of Ringois is unknown.

It remained to find the money for the first instalment of the ransom. It was procured by a shameful expedient. "The King of France," says the historian Mattee Villani, "sold his flesh and blood." He handed over, in exchange for 600,000 florins, his daughter Isabella, eleven years of age, to the son of the most ferocious tyrant in Italy, John Galeazzi Visconti, who hunted men in the streets of his capital and hurled them alive into furnaces. Thanks to the receipt of this money the king left Calais October 25.

Last Acts of King John : The Second House of Burgundy.— On December 5 an ordinance was issued by John announcing that, despite the great pity which he felt for his people, there would be levied a new tax on all merchandise sold or exported, also a tax on wine. In return, the king promised henceforth to do good and true justice to all, to place only good money in circulation, to abolish the right of plunder, and to remove other abuses which weighed heavily on the poor. Neither the promises nor the ordinance produced any result, as nothing could be produced from a land which a renewal of the Black Death was then devastating, which the English had ravaged, which the grand companies were still ravaging, and where there was nothing left to take. It was necessary to have recourse to other resources, to borrow, to revoke all grants made by previous kings since Philip the Fair, to make terms with the Jews, who were not only re-established in the kingdom but also granted considerable privileges.

With the money thus procured, the king might have devoted himself to destroying the bands of brigands, who had of late wasted the realm from Lorraine to Provence, and who defeated and killed James of Bourbon at Brignais near Lyons. Instead, John went short journeys at great expense to take possession of the inheritance of the Capetian line of Burgundy, which the death of Philip of Rouvres placed in his hands. From Burgundy John went south to Avignon, where he spent six months in festivities and in planning a marriage with the famous Queen Joanna of Naples. The pope, who had already been twice held to ransom by the grand companies, made John a proposition

calculated to appeal to his chivalrous imagination; that he should lead a crusade at the head of these warlike bands and win glory for himself while freeing France from their presence. It is not impossible that John would have engaged in this foolish enterprise, had he not heard at this moment that his son, the Duke of Anjou, had escaped from the hands of the English, who held him as a hostage. John believed that his honour was concerned towards a fellow-king, and determined to take his son's place. He thus escaped in a chivalrous manner from the embarrassments of his position and from the spectacle of the misery of France. He spent part of the winter in London in "great rejoicings and amusements, in dinners and suppers, and in other like ways." The fêtes and banquets killed him; he died at London at the age of forty-four (April 8, 1364). He deserves credit for the example of good faith which he gave.

One of his last acts, which was more fatal to France than the Battle of Poitiers, was the grant of the duchy of Burgundy to his son, Philip the Bold. Philip founded in this great fief the second ducal house of Burgundy, which in the following century almost accomplished the ruin of the kingdom.

In 1351, John created the first order of the court, that of the *Étoile*, which supplied the model for the Order of the Golden Fleece, created in 1439 by the Duke of Burgundy. True chivalry departed when the kings undertook the creation of an official chivalry.

CHAPTER XXX

CHARLES V. THE WISE (1364–1380)

Charles V. (1364–1380): Restoration of Order in the Realm and in the Finances.—The house of Valois, which had not yet rendered any services to the state, had cost it dear; two great defeats, a condition of misery and a shameful treaty which threw back the development of France a century and a half. But it now gave France in exchange a prince who merited his surname of the Wise. Charles was then twenty-seven. His previous conduct had not been such as to raise great hopes. As a warrior, he had acquired an evil reputation at Poitiers, where he had been one of the first to take to flight; as a statesman, he had shown no better at Paris during the revolution. The weakness of his health and even of his moral character did not suggest

that he was a man able to repair the disasters of the previous reign. "He understood Latin thoroughly and was well enough acquainted with the rules of grammar. From the moment of his accession, he sent through the land to seek out and summon to him learned clerks and philosophers skilled in the mathematical and speculative sciences."

This weak and sickly king, who passed his life shut up in his Hôtel St. Pol or at the château of Vincennes, surrounded by solemn clerks and astrologers, appeared to be a man little suited to an age when there was war on every side and in which the lance and sword were so necessary. But in addition to the wise men and philosophers who surrounded the king, other figures were associated with him, a veritable school of captains, the two illustrious Bretons, Bertrand Du Guesclin and Oliver de Clisson; Boucicault, Louis de Châlons, Le Bègue de Vilaines, Edouard de Renty, the lords of Beaujeu, Pommiers, and Reyneval. They were not the knights paladin of the earlier age; they knew how to give vigorous sword-thrusts, but that was not the limit of their knowledge. For the first time for many ages in France they understood that there was an art of war. They studied, if not strategy, at least stratagems and abandoned that absurd insistence on supposed points of honour which had caused the disasters of Crecy and Poitiers. They substituted ingenuity, ruses, and even fraud, by these means securing victory and all that victory implied. Charles V. adopted these ideas and employed these generals as he employed his wise men; while the statesmen examined charters, interpreted treaties, discussed and negotiated, the soldiers, under the direction of the king, who guided them from his cabinet, waged a war in which there was little glory on the surface, but which was very profitable in actual fact and of which the result was the eventual territorial reconstruction of the kingdom.

The Treaty of Bretigny had not brought the war to an end. Charles the Bad resumed the prosecution of his claims and his demands for pecuniary grants; the Bretons continued their war of succession, which had lasted for more than twenty years, and the kingdom was terribly wasted by the great companies. Charles V. dealt with each of these difficult matters in turn.

Struggle with the King of Navarre.—The possessions of Charles the Bad in Normandy were a source of great uneasiness to the king. With his two towns of Mantes and Meulan, the King of Navarre barred the passage of the Seine and was able to bring the English into the heart of France. Charles V. determined to

deprive his rival of them, and the war which followed was waged on the same principle as was adopted in all the wars of this reign.

One morning Boucicault, with nine companions, presented himself at the gates of Nantes, as if in terror and pursued; he asked the burghers to open their gates to him, saying that the brigands of the Rolleboise had defeated and were following him, and would spare neither Navarrese nor French. The burghers doubted the story, but Boucicault reassured them, giving them his word of honour; he was permitted to enter the town. More and more pretended fugitives arrived, until they were in such numbers that they declared the town taken, and seized the gates, crying, "Saint Yves Guesclin," and began to kill and mutilate the inhabitants. A similar exhibition of treachery delivered Meulan to the French, and the treatment inflicted upon the credulous burghers was the same.

Du Guesclin: Battle of Cocherel (1364): Treaty with Charles the Bad (1365).—Charles of Navarre, to avenge himself, sent an army of Navarrese into Normandy, accompanied by English and Gascons and under the command of Jean de Grailly, Sieur de Buch. On the other hand, Du Guesclin also entered the province with a mixed force of men-at-arms and starving archers. His army had had nothing but bread to eat for two days. In order to induce them to attack, Grailly covered a table with wines, hams, and every kind of food, but not a Frenchman left his ranks, and the Navarrese were forced to await the onslaught on a hill, on which they were cleverly posted not far from Cocherel. The knights of Crecy and Poitiers would at once have delivered a frontal attack; Du Guesclin did likewise, but after a preliminary encounter, he caused the retreat to sound and feigned flight. At this sight, the English commander, John Joel, despite Grailly's orders, charged into the plain, shouting, "St. George to the fore: let who loves him follow." Grailly would not abandon him and followed. Du Guesclin had expected this mistake; he turned and fell heavily on the enemy. He had prepared another ruse of war. Thirty knights, the bravest in his force, mounted on the thirty best horses, were instructed to devote all their attention to the capture of Grailly. Recognising him as, battle-axe in hand, he fought on foot at the head of his men, they all hurled themselves on him, captured him, and withdrew at a gallop. This exploit, and the fact that John Joel was mortally wounded, decided the day (May 16, 1364). Du Guesclin had promised Charles this prize;

by it Charles the Bad was induced to treat and to accept the essential condition offered him by the King of France, that he should exchange his Norman fiefs for the barony of Montpellier, where he would be out of touch with the English.

End of the Breton War: Battle of Auray: Treaty of Guérande (1365).—War still continued in Brittany. In 1350, the struggle had been marked by a celebrated feat of arms, the fight of the thirty. Robert de Beaumanoir, governor of the castle of Josselin, defied Richard Bramburg, an Englishman who commanded the castle of Ploermel. They met on the shore near Josselin, each with twenty-nine companions. The fight was long and bloody. Beaumanoir, wounded early in the combat and suffering from thirst, demanded something to drink. One of his comrades, Geoffrey Dubois, cried, "Drink your blood, Beaumanoir," and went on with the fight. Four Frenchmen and nine English, Bramburg among the latter, were killed, and almost all the others on both sides were wounded. The English surrendered to the French.

Such exploits hardly advanced the general situation, and the war dragged on until the Battle of Auray (1364). The Kings of France and England had reserved to themselves the right of assisting the two claimants to the duchy without breaking the truce between them. In virtue of this remarkable provision, the King of France placed at the service of Charles of Blois a thousand lances and his most able commander, Bertrand Du Guesclin. The English declined to remain passive, and the Prince of Wales supplied John of Montfort with 200 lances, thirty archers, and a good number of knights under the brave and prudent Chandos. A battle took place at Auray. The English and Montfort occupied a hill near Cocherel, a position similar to that at Poitiers. Du Guesclin was not so rash as to attack them in such a position, but Charles of Blois was resolved to fight. The Breton lords were anxious to end this long rivalry, and had resolved that if Charles of Blois were found, he should not be held to ransom but killed. The French party had come to a similar resolve with regard to John of Montfort, in order that the war might be ended by this battle.

Being compelled to fight, Du Guesclin disposed his men so well that the English commander could not conceal his admiration. "God help me," he cried, "truly there is here the flower of chivalry, good sense, and good equipment." Chandos was also an able leader, and in addition to the advantage which the position gave him, he had placed a force in reserve to assist his men

if they began to give way. This precaution ensured his victory: despite all his courage and prudence, Du Guesclin was taken prisoner and was only ransomed at the cost of 100,000 livres, the equivalent of six million francs. Charles of Blois, with his chief supporters, was killed. The defeat did not produce very serious consequences. The king negotiated and by the Treaty of Guérande (April 11, 1365) John of Montfort was recognised as Duke of Brittany, the widow of Charles of Blois being granted the county of Penthièvre and the viscounty of Limoges. John IV., though he had been restored by English arms, came to Paris (December, 1366), and did homage to Charles V., his chancellor declaring on his behalf that he did such homage as his predecessors, the dukes of Brittany, had been wont to do to the kings of France, leaving it undecided whether that homage was or was not liege homage, whether the duke did or did not owe the king service towards and against all men.

The Grand Companies: French Intervention in Castille.—As hostilities ceased in Normandy and Brittany, another scourge made itself felt, as the grand companies were increased by all the disbanded soldiers. Driven from the frontier provinces where the people were more energetic and united, the adventurers turned towards the heart of the kingdom, to which they all hastened, so that they called the kingdom of France their chamber. In order to free the land, a crusade was suggested and the King of Hungary offered to take them into his service against the Turks. But the grand companies found the journey to Hungary too long and returned home. Another expedition made a greater appeal to them. Castille groaned under the tyranny of Pedro the Cruel, who had poisoned his wife, Blanche of Bourbon, sister-in-law of the French king. When, therefore, Pedro's natural brother, Henry of Trastamara, demanded the protection of France, Charles V., to aid him in the overthrow of his brother, offered him the grand companies under the command of Bertrand Du Guesclin, who had been released from captivity. The expedition assumed the character of a crusade. There was talk of an advance to Granada and of the expulsion of the Moors. It was alleged that Pedro was certainly the son of a Jew; his mother was said to have exchanged her daughter for the child of a Jewess and in proof of this it was declared that all the conduct of Pedro was Jewish and that the Jews in his realm enjoyed a disgraceful degree of credit. War against such a man was clearly a crusade, and in order to begin their expedition religiously, the grand companies went to Avignon, and exacted

from the pope a general absolution, his blessing, and the sum of 200,000 francs.

No fighting occurred. Pedro was abandoned by all, and took refuge first with the Moors at Granada and then in Portugal. Thence he went to Bordeaux where he asked the English to assist him to regain his throne, promising to cede to the Black Prince the province of Biscay and to pay him 600,000 florins, which he had concealed in safe places. "To this news, the prince's knights listened eagerly, for the English and Gascons are very greedy by nature."

The Prince of Wales recalled to his standard the English and Gascon adventurers who were serving with Du Guesclin, crossed the Pyrenees at the head of a numerous army, and reached the Ebro without difficulty. But it was hard to live in these desolate provinces, and had Henry been wise enough to avoid battle, the English host would soon have perished from hunger. But despite the prayers of Du Guesclin it was decided to attack the invaders, Henry crying, "By my father's soul, I desire to see this prince and to measure my strength with his, so that we will not part without a battle." An engagement took place near Najara (April 3, 1367), the superiority of the English archers and the ability of John Chandos assured the Black Prince and his ally a victory which the French disputed for a time. Du Guesclin was again taken prisoner; Henry of Trastamara was expelled, Don Pedro was restored; and the Prince of Wales found himself master of a great part of Spain, as, after Poitiers, he had been master of a great part of France.

Difficulties of the Black Prince in Guienne.—After this victory the difficulties of the English were renewed. It was necessary to find means of livelihood, and everything was lacking. The treasures which Pedro had boastfully promised probably did not exist, and having no other provisions, the English ate greedily of the fruits of the country, with the result that the health of the nobles was ruined. The heat and the climate of Spain did their work; the prince himself became weary and ill. He resolved to recross the mountains, to regain the fertile land of Guienne. But the Gascons, who had made the campaign in hope of a rich reward, loudly demanded their pay. Being unable to give them money the prince was forced to demand it. He assembled the States of the province at Niert and announced to them the levy of a hearth tax of ten shillings on each hearth. The States answered that they would not pay it, and maintained this refusal, though the tax was removed to Angoulême, Poitiers, and Bergerac.

Dissension arose between the two parties. "The nature of the men of Poitou, Saintonge, Quercy, Limousin, and Rouergue was such that they could not love the English, and the English on their side, being proud and presumptuous, could not love them, but instead despised and hated them."

The Gascon Nobles appeal to the King of France (1369).—The Gascons went farther than their refusal to pay taxes. The Counts of Armagnac, Périgord, and Comminges, the Sieur d'Albret, and many other barons of the district went to Paris and laid an appeal before Charles V. against the conduct of the Prince of Wales. The appeal was heard, and at the beginning of 1369 a criminal judge and a knight of Beauce came to Bordeaux to present to the Black Prince the following summons from the king: "Charles, by the grace of God, King of France, to his nephew, the Prince of Wales and Aquitaine, greeting. As so many prelates, barons, knights, universities, communes, and colleges of the marches and borders of Gascony have now come to our court to seek redress for certain grievances and undue evils which you proposed to inflict upon them, therefore, to avoid and to remedy these things, we have discussed with them and heard them, and now command you that you come to our city of Paris and appear in our chamber of peers, to hear right concerning the said complaints, and that you make no default, and that you come as soon as you are able after receiving these letters." "We will willingly go to Paris," answered the prince, "since the King of France has sent for us, but it shall be with helm on head and 60,000 men in our train." Charles V., as if he had no intention of breaking the truce, sent to Edward III., in proof of friendship, fifty pipes of wine. The English bravely refused them; clearly war was inevitable.

Prudent Conduct of Charles V.: Adventurous Policy of Edward III.—It was the fact that he was ready for war while his enemies were not, that had given the cautious Charles this boldness and induced him to take so decisive a step. A wise economy had allowed him in 1367 to reduce the *gabelle* on salt by one half, to remit to the peasants half the taxes and to the burghers a quarter, on condition that they employed the money which the king left them in the fortification of their towns. He had organised in various strong places bodies of burgher archers, who, while unable to resist the English archers in the open field, would be capable of rendering good service from the height of their walls. Finally, in 1369, he had amassed enough money in his treasury, produced enough order in his kingdom, and created enough

discipline in his army to dare to renew the war. Edward III., on the other hand, wished only to rest on his laurels, and had thrown himself into adventures which dissipated his resources and increased the number of his enemies. He treated Scotland with an insulting contempt, and revived on behalf of his son Edmund those claims to Flanders which had been made for the Black Prince in the days of Artevelde; he maintained a hateful tyrant in Castille, and by his possession of Biscay menaced Spanish independence.

Successful Foreign Policy of Charles V.—Charles V. carefully revived that ancient and valuable alliance between France and Scotland which the two peoples declared had already lasted six hundred years. He married his brother, Philip the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, to the heiress of some German provinces, as he preferred a prince of his own blood to one of English blood in those territories. He also won over the King of Navarre, whose attitude had so far been undecided, and in Castille he overthrew the protégé of England, Pedro the Cruel. Du Guesclin accomplished this last revolution. He was at Bordeaux, weary of his captivity, when the Black Prince one day met him and said, "How do you fare, Bertrand?" "Wonderfully, sire," answered Du Guesclin, "for it is said that I am the foremost knight in the world, since you do not dare to put me to ransom." The prince, piqued, at once offered Du Guesclin the fixing of his own ransom, and the Breton put it at 100,000 livres. "And where will you raise it, Bertrand?" "The King of Castille will pay one half and the King of France the other, and if that do not suffice, there is not a farmer's wife in France who will not pluck a fowl to pay my ransom." Charles V. sent Du Guesclin to Spain, where he defeated Pedro at the Battle of Montiel (March 14, 1369) and restored to the throne Henry of Trastamara, who in return placed the Castillian fleet at the disposal of France.

This reign of skilful alliances made the time ripe for France to tear up the disgraceful Treaty of Bretigny. Charles felt that the moment had come when he might insult the English; he caused his defiance to be borne to England by a varlet of his kitchen, who delivered the letter to Edward at Westminster in full parliament.

Confiscation of Guienne.—In order to give legal colour to his proceedings, Charles assembled the States-General at Paris (May 9, 1369) and submitted to them the dispute between himself and the King of England. He showed himself affable and gracious, telling the States that if he had done too little or too

much, they should tell him truly. They were in cordial agreement with him. The court of peers, consulted in their turn, declared that as Edward and his son had not appeared before them the duchy of Aquitaine and the other lands which they held in France ought to be confiscated.

English Invasion (1369): Another System of Warfare.—The English landed at Calais. A powerful French army, under the Duke of Burgundy, went to meet them, but avoided all pitched battles and retired as the invaders advanced. The towns were well fortified and well defended, and the English could not take one; their expedition degenerated into useless ravaging of the open land. In 1370 they returned, but the same plan was unfalteringly followed. The prohibition on fighting was so definite and so rigorously observed that at Noyon, when an enemy knight passed the barriers of the town crying, "Sirs, I have come to see you; you dare not go outside your barriers and I dare to enter them," he was allowed to depart safe and sound. There was the same passive resistance at Reims and Paris. From the Hôtel St. Pol, where he remained shut up, the king saw the burning villages, but the brave Clisson himself said, "Sire, do not use your men against these madmen: let them wear themselves out. They will not deprive you of your heritage with all this smoke." To fulfil a vow, an Englishman came up to the Faubourg St. James and planted his lance in the gate; the knights who guarded the barrier applauded his boldness and allowed him to go free. But a butcher could not bear this shame; he ran after the Englishman and killed him with a stroke of an axe.

Last Expedition of the Black Prince: Sack of Limoges (1370).—"There has never been a King of France who has armed himself less, and never one who has given me more trouble," said Edward III. In truth, Charles V., sickly and delicate, never took lance in hand; he preferred to be among his books. He had the best library of the period, 910 volumes, carefully guarded in a tower of the Louvre with chains of iron. Each year the king read the whole Bible; he wrote to the pope and sent him presents, he walked in pious processions with the queen, dishevelled and barefoot. A prince so friendly with the pope and so pious deserved to have all the bishops of the kingdom as his allies, and the majority did open the gates of their towns to this good King of France. Even those upon whom the English most counted, such as the Bishop of Limoges, the friend of the Prince of Wales, "turned French," as the saying was.

This last treason angered the English. The Black Prince swore by his father's soul that he would not rest until he had taken Limoges and made the traitors pay dearly for their treason. When he arrived before the place, he caused part of the walls to be breached and through this opening his soldiers poured into the streets. The prince himself was borne forward in a litter. Men, women, and children fell on their knees before him, praying for mercy, but he paid no attention and heard no cry, giving them all up to the sword, more than 3000 persons being massacred.

The violence of the English was only calmed by the interest they took in a combat between three French knights and the Duke of Lancaster and the Earls of Cambridge and Pembroke. The Prince of Wales caused his litter to be stopped that he might enjoy this spectacle and he allowed the three knights to be granted quarter. He even pardoned the bishop, the chief author of the treason. This sad exploit was the last achievement of the Black Prince (1370); he languished some years longer and then went home to die in England (1376).

Decisive Success of Charles V.—The English possessed an excellent infantry in their archers whose arrows could pierce the best armour, and in their men-at-arms who were almost equal to a regular cavalry owing to their spirit of discipline and their skill in manœuvring. To oppose these forces, Charles had only a vast crowd of nobles, who were brave but wholly undisciplined. Prudence counselled the avoidance of pitched battles, but in the intervals between great expeditions the king was quite willing that his knights should break some lances, and especially the brave Du Guesclin, who had been recalled from Spain after the Battle of Montiel and made constable. He defeated Robert Knollys, one of the most famous English captains, at Pont-Valain (1370), and gained another success at Chizez in Poitou (1373). Chandos had already been killed in the first campaign, and another leader of great renown, the Captal[1] de Buch, was taken near Soubise (1372). From this time the French made consistent progress.

The king had a war of his own, and the bulletins of his victories are inscribed in the Collection of Ordinances. Thus, under the date 1370, the following entries appear: "February: Letters patent permitted the inhabitants of Rodez to trade throughout the whole kingdom without paying duty for the merchandise which they bought. March: Letters patent permitting the

[1] Chief.

inhabitants of Figeac found within the territory under the control of Edward, son of the English king, to be free from disturbance in their possessions, if they returned to lands under the control of the French king. An ordinance granted privileges to the town of Montauban. April: An ordinance granted privileges to the town of Verfeuil. May: Letters patent exempted the town of Milhaud from taxes for twenty years and an ordinance granted privileges to the town of Tulle. June: Ordinances granted privileges to the people of the county of Tartas, to the town of Dorat, and to the town of Puy-Mirol. July: An ordinance granted privileges to the town of Cahors, to the town of Castres, to the town of Puy-la-Roque, to the town of Sarlat, to the town of Montegrier, and to the town of Salvetat."

Recovery of Poitiers (1372).—In these ordinances are to be found the engines of war employed by Charles V. As for the towns, the gates of which were not opened by royal ordinances, his captains overcame them by their ruses of war, by force and negotiation. Du Guesclin laboured secretly with the people of Poitiers, who, like the people of other towns, had remained French at heart. He entered the town with 300 lances. Charles V. then granted titles of nobility to all who for the future should occupy the office of mayor of Poitiers (1372).

Recovery of La Rochelle (1372).—Bordeaux and La Rochelle were then rival towns, and as the former was English at heart the sympathies of the latter were for the opposing party. An English garrison of a hundred men, under Philip Mansel, held La Rochelle. One day when Mansel was dining with the mayor, John Caudourier, a letter arrived from the King of England. The governor recognised the royal seal, but that was all that he could do, for he could not read. He therefore asked his host to read it for him and the mayor in a loud voice read a message which he had composed on the spur of the moment and which conveyed to Mansel an order that on the following day (August 15, 1372) the garrison should be reviewed with the burghers in the public square. While Mansel withdrew his men from the castle, in conformity with this order, a force placed in ambush by the mayor behind the old walls of the town cut off his retreat. He was obliged to surrender the citadel, and Du Guesclin, with two hundred lances, appeared to take possession in the name of the King of France. Some weeks before, a Castillian fleet had defeated an English fleet before La Rochelle.

Renewed and Fruitless English Invasion (1373).—None the

less the obstinate enemy reappeared (1373). Landing at Calais with 30,000 men, the Duke of Lancaster believed that he could conquer France; he only passed through it. His march was successful while he was in the rich northern provinces, but in the poor and barren districts of the centre, privation and sickness began. In Auvergne not a horse remained to him; at Bordeaux he had only 6000 men left, and knights and common soldiers alike begged their bread from door to door.

The English almost expelled from France (1380).—The English were now disgusted with this type of warfare. They did not renew the invasion in the following year, and in 1375 they demanded a truce which was prolonged until the death of Edward III. (1377). Charles then broke the truce and struck his blow. He set five armies on foot and conquered all Guienne, while a Castillian fleet, carrying French troops, ravaged the coasts of Kent and Sussex. In 1380 Bayonne, Bordeaux, and Calais, with Brest and Cherbourg, alone remained to the English.

Unsuccessful Attempt of Charles against Brittany (1378).—Charles attempted to repeat in Brittany the success which he gained in Guienne. He summoned Duke John to appear before his court of peers (June 20, 1378), and when the duke did not appear, his duchy was declared forfeit to the royal demesne. The Gascons had surrendered themselves to France; the Bretons would not allow themselves to be taken. Barons, knights, and squires signed a confederation at Rennes (April 26, 1379), to which the burghers themselves subscribed. John IV., who had been lately expelled from his duchy, was recalled. All the Bretons in the service of France, a considerable number, abandoned it, and even those who had promised to support the designs of Charles turned against him. The aged Du Guesclin handed back the constable's sword, and a treaty of alliance was signed (March 1, 1380) between England and Brittany at Westminster. Once more an English army landed at Calais; it was commanded by the Earl of Buckingham and passed through northern France with impunity. It had not yet reached Brittany when Charles died at Vincennes (September 16, 1380).

Du Guesclin preceded the king to the tomb by two months. He died under the walls of the castle of Randon; its English governor had promised to surrender it if help did not arrive, but when the warrior was dead he regarded himself as absolved from his oath. Marshal Sancerre at once assembled the hostages before the walls to execute them; the English let down the drawbridge and offered him the keys of the place. Sancerre

refused them. " Your treaty was made with the lord Bertrand," he said, " and you shall surrender to him without delay." They were then led to the house where the corpse of Du Guesclin lay and the keys were laid on the bier.

Cession of Walloon Flanders.—Another error of the king lost a province, though this was of his own free will. In 1369, in order to hasten the marriage of his brother, the Duke of Burgundy, with the heiress of the Count of Flanders, he abandoned French Flanders to him. Charles exacted a promise that the province should be restored after the death of the duke's father-in-law, but the Count of Flanders survived Charles V., and Philip the Bold easily secured release from his promise from Charles VI. Lille was lost to France for three centuries, until the reign of Louis XIV.

Administration: Permanence of Parliament.—The conquests of Charles were the result of a perseverance which never failed him, of his strict economy, of financial probity which had not before been known and which prevented recourse to the disastrous methods of debasement, and finally to those beneficial regulations for the government of the state which earned for him the surname of the Wise. He made parliaments permanent instead of occasional, and handed over to them the old palace of St. Louis, which thenceforth became the Palais de Justice.

Ordinances relating to the Majority of the Kings and to Royal Appanages.—An ordinance of Charles V., which remained the law of the monrachy until the Revolution, fixed the majority of the French kings at the completion of the thirteenth year. Another ordinance separated the regency from the custody of the royal person, so that the two might never be held by the same person, and a third, in order to prevent the dismemberment of the demesne, gave to the king's children pensions in place of appanages, 12,000 livres secured on land ; 40,000 francs to the eldest son, 100,000 to the eldest daughter, and 60,000 to the others.

Favour shown to the Burghers : Further Reduction of the Privileges of the Nobles.—The town corporations had begun to menace industrial society as the communes had once menaced political society, and Charles V. attempted to establish the freedom of industry. An ordinance (September, 1358) laid down that all who could do good work should be allowed to practise their trade in Paris. But custom was too strong for the law, and the project was abandoned, not to be revived until the time of Turgot. In 1370, at the moment of the last breach with England,

an ordinance authorised the burghers of Paris to wear gold spurs and the ornaments of knights, to whom they were permitted to marry their daughters. The ideas of a king little favourable to feudalism here appeared, and were still further illustrated by another ordinance which granted nobility to the provosts and sheriffs of the city. The same king who ennobled the burghers of his own accord caused a number of castles to be destroyed on the ground that they served as places of refuge for the English. He also permitted open resistance to those who tried to exercise the right of seizure contrary to the ordinances, that is, who did not pay for the provisions which they took and the carts which they used. He also succeeded in depriving the nobles of such sovereign prerogatives as had remained to them, by reserving to the king all legislative power. An ordinance of 1372 gave to the crown the exclusive right to issue charters to communes or burghers, or to ennoble them. The monarchy had already taken from the barons the right of private war, of coining money, and of final judgment. Their regalian rights, in short, had been taken from them, but there still remained to them, until they also could be suppressed, their administrative and military powers, which the king used and which he subordinated to his supreme authority.

Increase and Permanence of Indirect Taxation.—In the reign of this restorer of society there were some shadows. Both as regent and king, Charles stifled every expression of liberty. For his wars, his building, and his negotiations he needed money in abundance and he increased taxation; if the permanence of the ground rent or *taille* is due to his grandson, that of indirect taxation or *aides* was due to him. It is just to add that the *aides* fell on all articles of consumption and thus indirectly on every one, on the noble and the clerk no less than on the peasant. But Charles was the first to compel every family to buy from the royal farmers the amount of salt which was supposed to be needed by them, without reference to whether they were able to dispose of this onerous acquisition. In place of himself paying the members of the parliament, he gave them as salary the fines which they imposed. This was not calculated to increase respect for justice.

Collectors and Generals of Finance.—An institution which lasted until 1789 is traced to this reign. The States of 1356-1357 instituted commissioners-general and under them collectors for the assessment and receipt of taxation. Charles V. preserved these officials, who became royal functionaries instead of being

chosen by the people. In course of time their numbers were increased and the districts over which they had control acquired the names of *pays d'election* and *généralties*. The elected officials supervised the assessment and collection of taxes and were judges in the case of financial disputes, while the generals of finance judged such cases in the last resort. The last named formed the court of *aides* which received its final constitution from Charles VII.

Public Works: Encouragement of Learning.—Charles V., despite his economy, was a great builder. He began the Bastille, repaired and extended the walls of Paris and the Louvre of Philip Augustus, built the Hôtel St. Pol, of which the gardens went down to the Seine, and the châteaux of Beauté, Plaisance, and Melun, the actual chapel of Vincennes, and other public works. He wished to unite the Loire and Seine by a canal, an idea which was realised two centuries later by Henry IV. He encouraged letters, caused the Bible to be translated, as well as the works of Aristotle, St. Augustine, and Livy, he inspired the writing by Bonnor of the *Arbre des Batailles*, the first treatise on the law of peace and war, and by Raoul de Presle or Charles Louviers the *Songe du Verger*, a work in which the author tried to define the limits of royal and papal authority. He formed a collection of 910 volumes, which was the beginning of the royal library, and created colleges of astronomy and medicine at Paris.

Froissart.—Among the men of letters of this reign, Froissart has not been mentioned, both because he was not, like the others, of the royal household and because he deserves separate notice. He was a Fleming, born at Valenciennes about 1337 and died in 1410, having passed his life at the courts of princes and nobles in England and France, their purses paying for the works preserved to us. His book is one of the most precious monuments of the French language and history, but is marked neither by the highest morality nor by the most profound patriotism. He favoured those who could best handle the lance, and his age was with him in this. The historian of Charles V. was a woman, Christina of Pisa, daughter of the royal astrologer, whose style was not naïf and brilliant as that of Froissart, but whose story, though less well told, is marked by more thought. With her, history tends to degenerate into chronicles, and her book, very inferior to those of Froissart and Comines, marks the transition from the one to the other.

Moral Decadence of the Fourteenth Century.—Despite Frois-

sart and despite the king's letters, the age was still a period of profound moral decadence, a time during which the progress of the world was stayed; there were no more great thoughts or wise doctors; intellectual and moral power alike decayed. The Middle Ages had already reached the point where they fall into oblivion, and where it becomes obvious that they have served their purpose.

The Great Schism.—The dual election of Urban VI. and Clement VII. in 1378 began, two years before the death of Charles V., the schism of the west, which lasted for seventy-eight years, dividing the allegiance of Christendom and preparing the way for the Reformation. France, and especially the University of Paris, made the most praiseworthy efforts to restore unity and peace to the Church.

Discoveries of the Dieppe Sailors in Africa.—During this reign, and thus long before the Portuguese, the men of Dieppe, then a great seat of commerce, discovered the coast of Guinea in Africa, whence they brought back pepper, gold-dust, and ivory. Carving in ivory is to the present day a special industry at the town of Dieppe.

St. Ouen of Rouen.—The magnificent abbey church of St. Ouen at Rouen also dates from this reign. In its architecture, which in civil construction had become burdened by caprice, it still preserved that severe tradition, the inheritance of the thirteenth century, which was found in all religious work.

Female Peers.—By letters of 1378, the Duchess of Orleans excuses herself for not taking her seat as a peer in the parliament. The Countess Mahaut of Artois assisted at the coronation of Philip V. and with other peers held the crown on the king's head.

CHAPTER XXXI

CHARLES VI. (1380–1422)

The Royal Family.—Charles V. was only forty-three when he died, and his death was a calamity for his country, as he left only a son of twelve. This child was forced to rely on his uncles, the Dukes of Anjou, Burgundy, and Berry, greedy princes, the first of whom was engaged in his claim to Naples, Queen Joanna having named him her heir; the second in the great fief of Flanders, to which he had become heir; and the third in his pleasures and riches. Charles VI. had another uncle on his

mother's side, the Duke of Bourbon, an excellent prince but devoid of influence; and a brother, the Duke of Orleans.

Rapine by the King's Uncles.—During the death agony of Charles V., the Duke of Anjou, his eldest brother, to whom the title of regent belonged, remained hid in a neighbouring room. As soon as the king was dead the duke caused the crown jewels to be handed over to him, and by threatening the treasurer, Savoisy, with death, secured also a treasure of gold and silver bars which had been cemented like stones in the walls of the château of Melun by masons who had afterwards been put to death. The year before, being Governor of Languedoc, the duke had excited a revolt by his rapine; in Montpellier alone he had condemned 200 citizens to be executed, 200 to the gallows, 200 to be burned, 1800 to forfeiture of their goods, and the rest of the town to a fine of 600,000 francs. The king had modified this terrible sentence and had recalled the duke. It was to such a prince that the regency fell. His brothers, like him, filled their hands. The Duke of Burgundy adjudged to himself the government of Normandy and Picardy; the Duke of Berry took Languedoc and Aquitaine, having already Berry, Auvergne, and Poitou; thus a third of the kingdom was given over to his rapacity.

The accession of a new king is always a time of hope. The abolition of certain taxes was demanded, and the duke promised to do away with all which had been established since the time of Philip the Fair. It was equivalent to a promise that France should no longer be governed, but the regent was not expected to keep his word. One day a public crier appeared on horseback in the great square and announced that the royal treasury had been robbed, and promised a large reward to any one who discovered the thief. When he saw the crowd struck by this news, he cried that on the next day a new tax would be levied on all merchandise sold, and then saved himself by galloping away.

Risings in Paris, Rouen, and Languedoc: Maillotins and Tuchins.—The next day (March 1, 1382), the collectors appeared at the market. One of them began to demand the tax on a little watercress which an old woman offered for sale. A furious riot ensued. The rebels ran to the Hôtel de Ville and the arsenal, and seized as arms the new mallets which they found stored there in view of an English invasion. The *maillotins* were for a time master of the town, but then, as was the case with all popular outbreaks of that period, fury made way for terror and discouragement. The princes, who had recovered their ascendancy, caused the most seditious to be privately executed and imposed ruinous

fines on the rest, with the proceeds of which the Duke of Anjou left for Italy. But the new tax was withdrawn and the rioters were only punished by confiscations. This revolt at Paris was rapidly imitated in the towns of Rouen, Reims, Châlons, Troyes, Orleans, and Sens, and was the match which fired two other insurrectionary outbreaks which began in Flanders in the north and in Languedoc in the south.

The Duke of Berry had hardly appeared in his government of Languedoc when war broke out against him. The pope intervened and a truce was effected, but the pope was unable to check the exactions and cruelty of the prince. The peasants, robbed by his soldiers, began a kind of *Jacquerie*, taking refuge in the mountains, more especially in the Cevennes, and thence organising armed bands which fell upon the nobles and gave no quarter to those whose hands were not hardened by manual labour. They were known as the *tuchins*.

War of Flanders: Battle of Roosebeke (1382).—The revolt of Flanders was even more serious. The Flemings had risen at the close of the previous reign against their French count, who seemed to take a delight in violating municipal privileges. Peter Dubois and Philip Artevelde, son of the famous brewer, had successfully directed a rising of the White Hoods, and the Battle of Bruges (May 3, 1382) had destroyed the last hopes of Count Louis. Philip Artevelde guided the revolution with the same spirit and in the same direction as his father had done ; deputies with full powers from the towns of Ghent, Ypres, and Bruges appeared at the court of Richard II. and offered to recognise him as King of France if he would assist them.

It seemed that for twenty-five years the spirit of revolt was vigorous in the burgher class throughout Europe. The rising of Rienzi in Rome, of Wat Tyler in England, of the *Jacquerie*, Marcel, the *maillotins*, *tuchins*, White Hoods, followed one another. As soon as insurrection was stifled in one direction it broke out in another, and there was ground for Froissart's fear that all gentlefolk and nobles would be killed and destroyed in France and everywhere else.

One day as the Dukes of Burgundy and Berry were discussing together the perils of the situation and the need for intervention in Flanders the young king entered with a falcon on his wrist. " What great counsel are you taking, my uncles ? " he asked. The Duke of Berry replied that the Duke of Burgundy was complaining to him of the Flemings who had deprived their lord and his men of their inheritance and who had a captain, Artevelde,

a very Englishman for courage, who was besieging a number of gentlemen at Oudenarde, and who declared that he would not leave the place. " And," added the duke, " he will have his will on the place if your power does not relieve it." The king cried that he was very ready to aid them, and that he wished for nothing better than to arm himself, as he had not yet borne arms, and could not reign with honour until he had done so. He wished to set out the next day or even at once.

A large army was soon ready. At its approach all the towns of Flanders made their submission, and the people of Ghent were left with no alternative but to win a great battle by throwing themselves, as had been done at Bruges, with the violence of a wild boar on the enemy. This they attempted at Roosebeke (November 27, 1382). They advanced in a serried column, that none might retreat, a plan which had served them well at Bruges against a small force. On this occasion, however, the wings of the formidable French army closed upon them and attacked the column, unable to move, on both flanks. The range of the knights' lances was greater than that of the Flemish spears, and the burghers were left with nothing to do but to bear the blows which fell upon them, so that the column was soon reduced to extreme disorder. Twenty-six thousand Flemings were left dead on the field, including almost the whole Ghent force with Artevelde. Flanders was not yet conquered, as Ghent held out for two years, but the nobles had at last avenged the defeat of Courtrai, and to extinguish the very memory of that day, when they left the town where they had lodged fifteen days and had found the banners of those who fell in 1302 hung in the churches, they gave it over to the flames after having sacked it. The Duke of Burgundy removed from the cathedral a magnificent clock which he carried away to Dijon, where it was placed at the south angle of the church of Notre Dame.

Executions at Paris and Rouen.—At Roosebeke, the revolt of Paris had been defeated no less than the revolt of Ghent. The Parisians saw that little leniency was to be expected by them, but they hoped that by showing their strength they might prevent any attempt against them. They went out to meet the king to the number of 20,000 armed men, ranged in battle array on Montmartre. At this news, the lords exclaimed against the proud *canaille*. " They did not come with the great army that served the king in Flanders; they took good care of themselves, and instead of ringing their bells to celebrate our victory, they dare to appear in arms before their king."

Heralds were sent to ask the Parisians, "Where are your chiefs, and who are your captains?" They answered that they had none save the king and the lords. The heralds then asked if the constable and four barons might come to them in safety. "You jest," said the Parisians. "Say that we are ready to receive our orders." The constable came into their midst and asked why they had come out of the town, as it seemed as if they wished to fight against their lord the king. They protested that they had no such desire and never had had, that they wished only to show the king the power of his good city of Paris, as he was young and knew not what they could do for him, if he had need. The constable answered, "That is good, but the king does not wish to see this just now; if you desire the king to come among you, you must go to your homes and lay down your arms." They obeyed.

The king arrived on the following day. The gates were all wide open; he wished to enter by a breach in the walls and caused one to be made. Then, helmet on head, he passed through the streets with his lance in hand and the most terrible expression that his young face could assume. Executions began at once, and the destruction of the liberties of the town. Its franchises, elective magistrates, provost, sheriffs, syndics, *centeniers*, *dizainers* (tithes-men) were abolished; its guilds, corporations, and brotherhoods were suppressed; and the chains which guarded the streets and the arms of the citizens were removed. Men were arrested summarily, tried and hanged out of hand. Three hundred of the richest burghers were drowned, hanged, or beheaded almost without a formal trial. The death of Nicholas the Fleming was specially noted. He was one of those who had followed Marcel on the day of the murder of the marshals twenty-six years before. John Desmarets, one of the negotiators of the Treaty of Bretigny and advocate-general of the parliament, tried himself by vain endeavours to reconcile the two parties. When he was brought to the market where he was to be executed he was urged to beg the king to forgive him. The old man turned and answered nobly, "I have well and loyally served his great-grandfather King Philip, King John, and King Charles, his father; none of these kings ever had occasion to reproach me, nor would this king reproach me if he had been full grown and had the wisdom of full age. I did not think that he would be guilty of such a judgment. I have no cause to ask mercy of him. From God alone do I beg mercy, and I pray Him that He will pardon my sins." (1383.)

The burghers were then assembled and a long list of their misdeeds was read, with the punishments which they deserved. At the moment when terror reached its height, the king's two uncles threw themselves at his feet and cried for leniency. Charles permitted himself to be moved and announced through his chancellor that the punishment due should be commuted into fines. "This was the true purport of this theatrical display," says Mezerai. Paris only escaped by paying 400,000 francs, some twenty millions according to modern values. At Rouen, Reims, Troyes, Châlons, Orleans, Sens, in Auvergne and in Languedoc, there were the same proceedings, and especially the same fines, all of which went, according to Froissart, to the profit of the Dukes of Berry and Burgundy, for they governed the young king.

This blow fell more grievously on the burghers than that of 1359, since the government had then been in the hands of a clever man who set bounds to the feudal reaction, whereas in 1383 the princes had a free hand. The upper ranks of the burghers were decimated, ruined, and when thirty years later the public ills produced a new revolutionary attempt, the higher class could not assume its direction, and that direction fell into the hands of violent men who drenched Paris in blood.

Reunion of Flanders and Burgundy (1384).—In 1384 the Count of Flanders died, and the Duke of Burgundy, his son-in-law, inherited his vast domains. Forthwith the house of Burgundy turned all its attention towards these rich provinces, and as it found further aggrandisement at the expense of the petty German princes, it gradually forgot both the blood ties by which it was bound and France, in which its greatness had begun.

Preparations for an Attack on England (1385) and Expedition against the Duke of Gueldres.—In the following year preparations were made on a vast scale for an attack on England. Fourteen hundred vessels were collected, enough to make a bridge from Calais to Dover. A city of wood was formed in sections that an entrenched camp might be carried with the invaders. But the favourable time for the attempt was allowed to pass, and the project was abandoned. Vast sums had been wasted. Another expedition against the Duke of Gueldres, who in return for an English pension of 4000 livres had defied the French king, cost still more and produced no result (1388).

End of the Government of the King's Uncles (1388).—The voice of public opinion was feeble, but it was yet audible. On his return from the unfortunate German expedition, the king held

a great council at Reims in the hall of the archbishop, where he demanded from those present that, on their allegiance, they should advise him as to the conduct of public affairs. Peter de Montaigu, Cardinal of Laon, spoke, praised the king's qualities, and urged him to begin the exercise of personal power, by directing, without reference to any one, all that concerned war and the management of his household. Others supported the cardinal's view; Charles VI. declared that he would adopt it, and thanked his uncles for the services which they had rendered. He had hardly left Reims when the cardinal was poisoned.

Ministry of the Marmousets (1388–1392).—The former advisers of Charles V., the small men, or *marmousets*, as the great lords disdainfully called them, Oliver de Clisson, Bureau de la Rivière, Le Bègue de Vilaines, John de Novian, John de Montaigu, once more undertook, as ministers of state, the direction of affairs. The new administration was wise, economical, devoted to order at home and peace abroad, but the king was only the more extravagant. The pleasures and distractions of war were denied him; he turned to those of fêtes and tournaments, and the fêtes went on continuously. At one time the occasion was the knighting of the sons of the Duke of Anjou; at another the first entry of Queen Isabella of Bavaria into Paris; or the marriage of the Duke of Orleans to the beautiful Valentina Visconti. The most serious undertakings became occasions for rejoicings. A journey to the southern provinces to end the great schism which distracted the Church and to supervise the disastrous administration of the Duke of Berry was nothing but one great fête, the expense of which was only equalled by the scandal that was caused. The ministers tried to check these disorders or to minimise their effects, economising in the service of the state in order to meet the extravagance of the king, and the state profited by this policy. Paris regained its provost; the burghers gained the right to acquire fiefs as if they had been nobles. The Duke of Berry was deprived of the government of Languedoc, 40,000 of the inhabitants of which had fled to Aragon, and as no other punishment could be inflicted, his treasurer, Bétisac, was executed.

The *marmousets* ruled France for four years, during which time the king's uncles, the greatest men in the land, were excluded from all share in the government. The princes laboured to put an end to this regime, and an Angevin lord, Peter de Craon, the mortal enemy of Clisson, the chief of the *marmousets*,

put his personal hatred at the service of the political antipathies of the aristocracy.

Attack on Clisson (1392).—On June 13, 1392, at the end of a fête given at the Hôtel St. Pol, the constable took leave, very late, of the king and the Duke of Orleans, and with eight servants, two of whom bore torches, made his way to the Rue St. Catherine. There Peter de Craon awaited him, with forty mounted bravadoes, not six of whom knew what they were about to do. As soon as Clisson appeared, Craon's men fell on his servants and put out their torches. Clisson thought at first that it was a jest on the part of the Duke of Orleans, whom he supposed to have followed him, and cried, "Sir, you are young and must be forgiven; these games suit your age." But Craon shouted, "Death, death, Clisson; you are to die." "Who are you that says such words?" asked Clisson. "I am Peter de Craon, your enemy; you have so many times crossed my path that you must now pay the penalty." The constable attempted to defend himself, but he was soon wounded and thrown from his horse. As he fell, his head struck the half-open door of a bakehouse, which gave under the blow, and this saved him. The assassins believed him dead. They had already recognised the constable, and alarmed at having attacked so important a personage they hastened to fly with Craon to the château of Sablé in Maine.

The news of this outrage was brought to the king as he was going to bed. He called his guards, caused torches to be lighted, and went to the bakehouse where Clisson was beginning to recover consciousness. He assured Clisson that no price would be too heavy to avenge this unprovoked and treacherous attack.

Insanity of the King (1392).—Peter de Craon, not believing himself safe at Sablé, took refuge with the Duke of Brittany, who, when summoned by the king to give up the traitor, caused Craon to be hidden and alleged that he knew nothing of the matter. Charles at once gathered an army, swearing that he would not rest until he had punished all these rebellions. The Dukes of Burgundy and Berry tried to hinder the expedition; their hatred for Clisson had increased since they learned his vast wealth, the constable, believing himself to be on the point of death, having made a will in which he disposed of 1,700,000 francs in movables, besides his fiefs and inheritance. But the king paid no attention either to the delays and ill-will of his uncles, or to the fears for his own sanity which were entertained by his doctors. He advanced with his army to Le Mans.

It was the height of summer, during the hottest days of

August. As he was passing through a forest, a man clothed entirely in white seized his bridle, crying, "Stop, noble king, go no farther; you are betrayed." This sudden apparition alarmed the king. A little farther on the page who bore the royal lance fell asleep on his horse; the lance fell and struck a helmet with a loud noise. At this sound of arms, the king turned pale, drew his sword, and cried, "Death to the traitors." He attacked with his naked sword his pages, his escort, of whom he killed four men, and his brother, the Duke of Orleans, who escaped with difficulty.

The king was mad. Some accused those nightmares of the period, the sorcerers; it would have been enough to accuse the king himself. Master for twelve years of that unlimited power which has often driven the most sober-minded mad, he had, at the age of twenty-four, exhausted all the pleasures, all the emotions, from those of debauchery to those of the field of battle. His constitution was ruined, his brain undermined, and a violent shock overturned his reason.

Restoration of the Government of the Princes.—When fears were expressed that the king was the victim of poison or sorcery, the Duke of Berry answered, "No, he is neither poisoned nor bewitched, except by evil counsels." This remark was the death-knell of the *marmousets*. Some days later, Clisson, having demanded from the Duke of Burgundy the pay of the soldiers who had followed the king in the late expedition, the duke looked at him and said, "Clisson, Clisson, you have done nothing but disquiet the realm, for without you it would have been well ruled. In an evil hour you interfered with it. How the devil did you manage to collect finances to such effect that you could make a will leaving 1,700,000 francs? My lord and brother of Berry and I, for all our power, would not be able to do likewise. Leave my presence and let me see you no more, for if it were not for my honour, I would have your other eye gouged out." Clisson hastened to his castle in Brittany, while the parliament declared him guilty of extortion, banished him from the realm, and fined him 100,000 silver marks. Montaigu, warned by this example, took refuge at Avignon, while de la Rivière, Novian, and de Vilaines were taken and imprisoned in the Bastille.

The king's uncles were thus restored to the full possession of power. The *marmousets* had been occupied with attempts to end the great schism; the princes worked for the same end with such success that soon they had three popes instead of two. They signed a truce with England for twenty-eight years

(1396), giving in marriage to Richard II. Isabella, daughter of Charles VI. But in 1399 this valuable alliance was ended by the deposition of the English king.

Crusade of Nicopolis (1396).—The Ottoman Turks were threatening Christendom: Sultan Bajazet had vowed that he would stable his horse on the altar of St. Peter at Rome. A crusade was decreed, but it was placed under the command of the Count of Nevers, a young man of twenty-four, afterwards John Sans-Peur, Duke of Burgundy. Young and old, all equally careless, joyously passed down the Danube, regarding the crusade as a pleasure trip. When they arrived near Nicopolis, Sigismund, King of Hungary, advised them to meet the advanced guards of the Turks with Hungarian infantry and light cavalry, holding the knights in reserve to meet the main body of the Ottoman army which would appear later. But no one was willing to forego the honour of striking the first blow. They all pressed into the first ranks, hurling themselves on the first enemy they saw; worn out and in disorder they reached the summit of a hill, where they were received by the redoubtable Janissaries, who had been organised by Amurath, and who were more than a match for a force out of breath and scattered. Bajazet caused ten thousand prisoners to be killed in his presence, sparing only from this massacre the Duke of Nevers and twenty-four lords whom he put to ransom.

The government of the aristocracy had not been fortunate; its policy discredited it abroad and its divisions weakened the country at home.

Isabella of Bavaria.—Isabella of Bavaria was not fifteen when she came from Germany to France to marry Charles VI. Without parents, without a guide in the midst of a corrupt court, she learned the manners of the country of her adoption more quickly than its language. She cared for nothing except luxury and pleasure. Years failed to render her conduct more regular or her mind more serious. From pleasure she descended to debauchery, and as, when the king became insane, she was charged with the guardianship of his person she used the authority given to her by her sad situation to satisfy her passions, her vices, and her vengeance. It soon appeared how disastrous this foreign queen was to France.

Murder of the Duke of Orleans.—Philip the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, retained his authority until his death in 1404. His son, John the Fearless, wished to inherit his father's influence on the government no less than his estates, but the Duke of Orleans

was disinclined to resign his power to any one. He was all-powerful with the queen and master through her of the king and the dauphin, who was also the head of a brilliant nobility and an accomplished knight himself. Rivalry soon began between them, and this rivalry threatened to develop into civil war even in the heart of Paris. Each of the rivals assembled his men-at-arms and fortified his hotel. A fight was on the verge of occurring when the aged Duke of Berry intervened, brought the Duke of Burgundy to the Duke of Orleans who was lying ill, caused them to embrace, to receive the communion together, and to eat together. This reconciliation took place on November 20, 1407. On the 23rd Louis of Orleans was dead, murdered by John the Fearless.

The duke had plotted this crime for more than four months. He had bought a house in which he wished, so he said, to store wine, corn, and other provisions ; there he hid sixteen assassins. The house was in the Rue Vieille du Temple, near the Barbette gate and on the road which the Duke of Orleans used in going from the palace to his own house. On Wednesday, November 23, at eight in the evening on a very dark night the duke left the Hôtel Montaigu mounted on a mule and having with him only two squires on a single horse, while four or five servants on foot carried torches. Though it was not late, all the shops were shut already. The duke remained behind his men, singing softly and toying with his glove, when the murderers, hidden by the corner of a house, fell on him shouting, " Death, death." The duke cried, " I am the Duke of Orleans." " Him we seek," they answered, striking him. A page tried to cover his master with his own body and was slain. A woman looked out of a window and cried murder ; one of the assassins called to her, " Silence, you hag." Then by the light of the torches she saw coming out of the house which the Duke of Burgundy had bought a great man, covered by a red cap which hid his eyes, and who, by the light of a straw taper, examined the Duke of Orleans to make sure that the blow had not failed as it had done in the case of the constable before. This time the murderers had well earned their wage ; the corpse was veritably hacked to pieces ; the right arm was severed in two places ; the left hand had been cut off and lay some distance away ; the head was cut open from one ear to the other, and the brains were scattered on the road. At this sight the wearer of the red cap said to the others, " Put out all the lights and let us go ; he is quite dead." Fire was set to the house which they had occupied and leaving pitfalls in the way of any

who might follow them, they retired to the Hôtel d'Artois in the Rue Mauconseil.

Next day John the Fearless went, as all the princes, to visit the dead and to sprinkle holy water on him at the church of the White Friars. "Never was a more traitorous murder done in the realm," he said as he gazed upon the corpse. He wept at the funeral and held a corner of the pall. Some days later when the provost of Paris announced to the council that he would discover the criminals if he were allowed to search the houses of the princes, John the Fearless was alarmed, turned pale, and, drawing the Duke of Berry and the King of Sicily aside, said, "I did it; the devil tempted me."

This momentary depression soon passed and the duke formed the resolve of avowing and justifying his crime. Next day he went boldly to the council of the princes, but his uncle, the Duke of Berry, met him at the gate and said, "Fair nephew, do not enter the council just now; I prefer that you should be elsewhere." John fancied that it was proposed to arrest him; he mounted his horse and rode as quickly as possible to his Flemish possessions, where he caused it to be said, preached, and written, that he had only anticipated the plots of the Duke of Orleans. A Franciscan monk, Doctor John Petit, undertook in the following year to show by twelve arguments in honour of the twelve apostles that if the duke had been slain it was for God, since he was a heretic; for the king, since he wished to usurp the throne; and for the commonwealth, since in him the state would have had a tyrant. To this strange *apologia* for murder the Duke of Burgundy added a bloody victory, killing 20,000 burghers of Liége at Hasbain (1408). Having produced so strong an argument in his defence he returned to Paris, promising the people an early abolition of taxes and securing from the king letters of pardon, by which Charles VI. declared that he bore him no ill-will for having put out of the world his brother, the Duke of Orleans (Peace of Chartres, March, 1409). The Duchess of Orleans, the beautiful and gentle Valentine Visconti, at least escaped seeing this shame of her family. The death of her husband killed her. She had taken as her motto, "Nothing is left to me; to me there is nothing worth." She died in 1408, as Juvenal des Ursins tells us, of a broken heart.

Factions of the Burgundians and Armagnacs (1410).—The Duke of Orleans did not deserve many regrets. His administration had been as deplorable as his ways. He had declared war against England, had not followed up the declaration, and had

made the nominal war an excuse for an increase of taxation, the proceeds of which he appropriated. The Duke of Burgundy stoutly opposed the new taxes; in order to conciliate the people and to lay hands on the rich spoils himself, he sent John de Montaigu, the superintendent of finance, to the scaffold. He restored to the Parisians their former free constitution, the right of electing their provost and of organising themselves into a burgher militia under elective leaders, as well as the right of holding fiefs of nobles with the privileges attaching to this right. He thus became extremely popular, and this popularity he increased by persistently showing a regard for the burghers to which they were not accustomed. The butchers, petty shopkeepers, and the people of the market supplied the main strength of the Burgundian party in Paris. The feudal party did not forgive the duke for relying upon such support, or for having impaired the prestige of the inviolable nobles by killing a prince of the blood, a brother of the king. A considerable faction among the nobles turned against John the Fearless, and the avengers of the Duke of Orleans ranged themselves under the banner of the father-in-law of one of his sons, the Count d'Armagnac, who gave his name to the party (1410). The king was mad, the queen hated and incapable, the chief prince of the blood guilty of an infamous murder; there was no government save rival factions in arms; there was war at home and abroad. Such was the condition of France, a condition only remedied by catastrophe.

Civil War.—Between 1410 and 1412 the two factions twice attacked each other and twice concluded a truce; in November, 1410, there was the Peace of Bicêtre and in July, 1412, the Peace of Bourges. Both parties made advances to the English in order to win over the national enemy to their side. If during these armed struggles there were no great battles there was an infinity of pillaging and murder in the country. At Paris processions were held to pray Heaven to endue the princes with the spirit of peace.

New Intervention of the Burghers of Paris to restore Peace (1410): The Cabochins.—In this crisis, which recalled the gloomiest days of the reign of John, the burghers, rather than the parliament, which held aloof, took the lead as they had done in 1356. The University of Paris was proud of having recently secured the deposition of two anti-popes, the election of Alexander V., a former doctor of the Sorbonne, and the summoning of a general council for the reform of the Church. The burghers believed that they could pacify the state, as the University hoped that it had pacified Christendom, and secured from Charles VI.

in one of his lucid intervals an order commending all the princes to return to their demesnes and stay there. But some months later the war was renewed. The Armagnacs committed countless atrocities and bade their victims seek vengeance from "the poor fool of a king." The body of citizens demanded that the royal council should entrust the defence of the city to the Count of St. Pol, a friend of the Duke of Burgundy, and he, being distrustful of the leading burghers, attempted to checkmate them by appealing to the masses. He depended on the great and wealthy corporation of the butchers, who were authorised to raise 500 men for the protection of the city. They armed their servants, the slaughtermen, skinners, and the rest, and this turbulent mob, used to bloodshed and slaughter, took as their chief the slaughterer Caboche. For a time they submitted to the guidance of their masters and of the doctors of the University, but then Paris presented a most singular and terrible spectacle. One day the multitude made its way to the residence of the dauphin, forced him to appear on the balcony, and there, by the mouth of their chosen orator, the old surgeon, John of Troyes, forced him to listen to their rebukes. He was told to banish the advisers who encouraged him in bad habits, the companions of his debauches; he was bidden to live a more regular life, to take care of his health and his reason. The butchers undertook to supervise this reformation of morals which they trusted would lead to the reformation of the kingdom. They mounted guard round the Hôtel St. Pol in order to safeguard the king and the Duke of Guienne, and as they heard too often at night the sound of music and dancing, they boldly entered the palace in order to stop it and to enforce decency and regularity. But these rude and violent spirits were not content with words alone. If they had compassion on "that fair child, the dauphin," they declared themselves against those who corrupted him; they dragged them before the parliament that they might be judged and on the way disposed of those who most displeased them.

The Cabochin Ordinance (1413).—Meanwhile the ablest leaders of the party, doctors and lawyers, prepared the great ordinance of 1413 for the repression of abuses. It was known as the Cabochin Ordinance, and its application would have been one of the most salutary measures in the history of the ancient regime. But this great charter of reform, the united work of the city and the University, though it found men who could conceive it, found none who could carry it out. The wise men and those skilled in the affairs of state had neither the will nor the necessary

political energy; they held aloof, and the movement fell into the hands of the extremists and the turbulent. By their intolerable excesses, these hastened a reaction which led to their fall and to the abandonment of reform.

Reaction : The Armagnacs at Paris.—The mob had violated that which the burghers respected; they proscribed not only vice and immorality but wealth; they mingled pillage and murder with reform. They finally disgusted even those who had at first employed them and who came to blush for their association with them, preferring the Armagnacs to the Cabochins. Summoned by all moderate men, the Armagnacs checked the excesses of the mob, but they also undid the reformation of the burghers (September 5, 1413). John the Fearless had hastily retired to his Flemish provinces; the victorious party pursued him and forced him to promise not to return to Paris (Treaty of Arras, September, 1414).

Battle of Agincourt (1415).—While the Burgundians and Armagnacs were fighting, Henry V. of England judged the moment ripe for intervention in the struggle. He had need to secure by a foreign war the throne which his father had usurped.

Remembering the great booty of a former century, war with France was always popular in England. When Henry proposed a serious expedition, he easily obtained 6000 men-at-arms and 24,000 archers, with whom he landed near Harfleur (August 14, 1415). After a heroic defence which lasted for a month, Harfleur, left without help, was forced to surrender. But Henry V. had lost 15,000 men, almost half his army. Too weak to attempt anything, he resolved to reach Calais by a march across country, and to hurl a fresh and insolent defiance at the French chivalry.

The English left Harfleur on October 8, 1415. They crossed the district of Caux not without some opposition, though they were careful only to demand wine and food from the towns in order not to rouse the population against them. They reached Abbeville on the 13th, hoping to cross the Somme, but found the fort of Blanchetaque so well guarded that they had to advance up the river as far as Amiens. Near Nesle a countryman showed them a ford across a marsh, a difficult and dangerous passage. They would have been lost if they had been attacked while making this crossing, but the French army was far in their rear, while the nobles were not anxious for a fight in a marsh. They desired a pitched battle in open country, and the princes demanded from Henry that he should name the place and day. The English king replied shortly that there was no need to name

either a day or a place, as they could meet him any day in the open field.

Despite this answer, there was some fear in the French army that the enemy would escape, and to ensure that he should be held, the princes posted themselves between the villages of Tramecour and Agincourt, in a narrow passage through which the English were bound to pass. The ground was newly ploughed and sodden with rain, and it was impossible for 50,000 men, of whom 14,000 were knights, to deploy and to manœuvre there. The Constable d'Albret disposed his army in three columns, but every one wished to be in the first column; the princes and the chief nobles placed themselves in it and it was more than thirty-two ranks deep. There were some thousand archers to meet the English bowmen, and there were cannons, but their place was occupied by the knights; archers and cannon were alike rendered useless.

The day at last arrived. The English archers launched their arrows, but the French could give no reply. "The place was soft and ploughed up by the horses," says an eye-witness, Lefebvre de St. Remy, "so that the horse had great difficulty in moving from the spot where they stood. The French were so laden with harness that they could not advance; they were weighed down by long suits of steel, reaching to the knees and very heavy; they were pressed so closely together that they could not raise an arm to strike their enemies, unless it was those in the first rank." Finally 1200 men on the two wings detached themselves from the mass and advanced against the English, but they were attacked by a force of English archers hidden in a neighbouring wood, while others slipped and fell in the mud. Only 120 reached the enemy and they were vigorously repulsed. Their retreat spread disorder in the vanguard; the English archers pursued them, and armed with axes, swords, and maces fell upon men and horse, capturing those who could not fly. Little blood would have been shed if a report had not circulated that a new body of the French army had arrived and was pillaging the baggage of the English, whom they were about to attack from the rear. Henry gave orders that the prisoners should be killed and this massacre was only stopped when it was known that the alarm was false.

The English left 1600 men on the field of battle, the French 10,000, among whom were seven princes and 120 barons. Fifteen hundred prisoners, among whom were the Dukes of Orleans and Bourbon, the Counts of Eu, Vendôme, and Richemont, fell into

the hands of the victors. With this valuable booty, Henry embarked at Calais; his army, reduced to 10,000 men, could attempt no further enterprise, but this wonderful victory was enough.

Massacre of the Armagnacs at Paris (1418).—The Duke of Burgundy had taken no part in the Battle of Agincourt; his enemies, the Armagnacs, had sustained this shameful defeat. Had he hastened, he might have made himself master of Paris. The Count of Armagnac, who had become constable, showed greater promptitude; he took possession of the capital, of the king, of the new dauphin who was still a child, in a word, of the whole government. To regain some popularity for his party, he showed a praiseworthy activity. He borrowed ships from the Genoese, raised men in France, and laid siege to Harfleur (1416). But money ran short; he had recourse to the great expedient of the period, and debased the coinage. John the Fearless forthwith posed as the patron of the poor.

Paris murmured. John the Fearless, to increase the discontent, prevented the passage of foodstuffs to the city. He next carried off Queen Isabella from Tours and caused her to be declared regent of the kingdom; in her name he forbade the towns to pay the taxes imposed by Armagnac while at the same time he negotiated with England (1417).

The English had renewed their invasion. Henry V. had taken Caen (1417), and as a victor who had nothing to fear he had divided his army into four divisions in order to hasten his work. He had indeed no cause for fear. The Dukes of Brittany, Anjou, and Burgundy had signed treaties of neutrality with him; Armagnac could not prevent this, since he had been reduced to borrow from the saints, causing their shrines to be melted down. His supporters abandoned him because they were insufficiently paid, and he was forced to hand over the guardianship of Paris to the burghers, whom he hated and by whom he was betrayed.

Perrinet Leclerc, a smith of Petit-pont, had the guard of the postern gate of St. Germain. His son and some young companions of middle estate and light mind (according to Monstrelet, who had been punished on occasion for their misconduct) plotted to hand over the city to the Burgundians. On the night of May 29, 1418, Perrinet entered his father's chamber while he slept and carried away the keys which were under his pillow. The Sieur de l'Isle Adam, warned beforehand, was waiting on the other side of the ditch. He entered the town with 800 men; the former supporters of the Burgundian faction, the butchers,

the slaughterers, and all the market people, hastened to join him. Some Armagnacs managed to escape, carrying with them the dauphin; the majority, among them the constable, were taken and thrown into prison. Their lives were soon in peril. That popular violence, which had first appeared in 1413, now reappeared, exasperated, furious from misery and anxiety. Foodstuffs of every kind were wanting in Paris, and the city was threatened with famine. Soon the most sinister news spread amongst the mob. The Armagnacs were about to attack this gate, that suburb; the English were threatening another. The cause of all these ills, so it was declared on all sides, was the Armagnacs whom they held; vengeance must be taken on them that their plots might end.

On Sunday, June 12, 1418, the populace rose and rushed to the prisons, the Hôtel de Ville, the Temple, St. Eloi, St. Magloire, St. Martin, the great and little Chatelet, to murder indifferently all whom they found, Armagnacs or not. By Monday morning 1600 persons had perished. They were slaughtered in the prisons and in the streets; the corpses lay where they were, and wretched children played at dragging them about. On the dead body of the constable they amused themselves by placing a large band of wool to indicate the white scarf of the Armagnacs.

These terrible scenes had taken place when John the Fearless and the queen returned to Paris, welcomed by the enthusiastic plaudits of the mob, who believed that under John they would receive peace and plenty. Their hope was vain. Neither the one nor the other depended on the Duke of Burgundy; on the contrary, to all the existing evils there was added an epidemic which carried off 50,000 persons in Paris and the neighbourhood. The populace again became frenzied and fell upon the wretches whom they had overlooked before or who had languished in prison since June. On August 21, a vast crowd gathered under the orders of the executioner Capeluche and moved upon the prison. The Duke of Burgundy hastened to it, prayed, and went so far as to grasp the hand of Capeluche. He made no impression; a new massacre occurred. Some days later John the Fearless sent this ferocious horde to besiege the Armagnacs who were, so he said, shut up in Montlhéry; as soon as they had gone out of the city, he caused the gates of Paris to be closed and Capeluche to be beheaded.

Capture of Rouen by the English (1417).—John the Fearless remained master of the capital and the government, but he was weighed down by the crushing load of responsibility which this

position laid upon him. He was called upon to end the famine and calm a maddened populace; to oppose the Armagnac party who had the dauphin in their power and who held all the district round Paris; to make headway against the English who were methodically conquering the kingdom. Having taken possession of all lower Normandy, of Falaise, Vire, St. Lo, Courance, and Evreux, the invaders were besieging Rouen. The town held out for seven months. Horses, dogs, and rats were eaten; 12,000 old men, women, and children were driven beyond the walls to die of famine between the city and the English camp; all the resources of the defence were exhausted and the government did nothing. The Duke of Burgundy received the *oriflamme* (ancient standard of France) from the king and advanced as far as Pontoise and Beauvais, but dared not go farther. The heroic city surrendered. Henry exacted the vast fine of 300,000 crowns and the death of three burghers, including Alan Blanchard, the chief of the bowmen and the bravest defender of the place (1419). Two ransomed themselves, but Alan was executed. Edward III. had been less ferocious.

On hearing of the fall of Rouen all the towns and places of the province opened their gates. Henry showed himself lenient and gave good terms to all who took the oath of fealty. One woman refused to do so. "The young Dame de la Roche Guyon, whose husband had been killed at Agincourt," says Juvenal des Ursins, "preferred to be deprived of all her possessions rather than do homage to a foreign king and so place herself under the yoke of the ancient foes of the kingdom."

The madness of the English reached its height owing to the conquest of this rich province. To offers of peace, addressed to him by the Duke of Burgundy, Henry answered by extravagant demands—a daughter of Charles VI. in marriage and with her Guienne, Normandy, Brittany, Maine, Anjou, and Touraine. As the duke hesitated, Henry said to him roughly, "Good cousin, know that we will have your king's daughter and the rest of our demands or that we will drive you and all of them together out of the realm."

Murder of John the Fearless (1419).—Repulsed on this side, John the Fearless turned to the Armagnacs and had an interview with the dauphin at Pouilly (July 11, 1419). But his doubts and hatred revived and he turned once more to the English. Then the determined men who surrounded the young dauphin, afterwards Charles VII., resolved to make an end after their fashion of the prince who wished to hand over the kingdom to

foreigners. On September 10, 1419, the Duke of Burgundy, invited to an interview with the dauphin at the bridge of Montereau, was stabbed by Tanneguy Duchâtel and the prince's servants.

Treaty of Troyes (1420).—The English benefited by the results of a crime which they had not committed. The crime of Montereau gave them that which Crecy, Poitiers, and Agincourt had failed to give them; it gave the crown of France to a King of England. On May 21, 1420, the shameful Treaty of Troyes was concluded between Henry V., the Duke of Burgundy, and Queen Isabella of France, by which the last-named disinherited her son to crown her daughter. The very summary of the terms may well cause shame to any Frenchman. "It is granted that after our death the crown and realm of France shall remain and shall be perpetually with our said son Henry and his heirs. The power of governing the kingdom shall remain during our lifetime with our said son, King Henry, who shall rule by the advice of the nobles and wise men of the said kingdom. All conquests which the said King Henry shall make from the rebels shall be regarded as made for us. Considering the horrible and dreadful crimes which have been committed in the said kingdom by Charles, so-called Dauphin of Viennois, it is agreed that we, our son the said king, and our very dear Philip, Duke of Burgundy, will conclude no peace or agreement with the said Charles save with the common assent of all and each of us three and of the three estates of the two said kingdoms."

Death of Henry V. of England and of Charles VI. (1422).—But the country did not agree to the Treaty of Troyes. The long and vigorous resistance offered to the English at Sens, Montereau, Melun, and Meaux, and the defeat and death at Baugé in Anjou of the Duke of Clarence, brother of Henry V. (March 23, 1421), showed the English king that all France was far from being on his side. He foresaw the difficulty of the situation and the character of so laborious a conquest after his death. When, already ill, he was informed, during the siege of Meaux, that his young wife had given birth to a son at Windsor Castle, it is said that he exclaimed sadly, "Henry of Monmouth will have reigned little and conquered much; Henry of Windsor will reign long and lose all. The will of God be done."

Both parts of this prediction were accomplished, and the fulfilment of the first part was not long delayed. Still young, Henry V. died on August 31, 1422. Seven weeks later, on October 21, Charles VI. died also, mourned and regretted by the

sympathetic people to whom his reign had proved so disastrous, but who had seen their king suffer with them. "All the people in the streets and at the windows wept and cried as if each had seen his best-loved die: 'Ah, most dear prince, never shall we have so good a king. Never shall we see you more. Cursed be death. We shall have nothing but war now that you have left us. Rest in peace while we remain in tribulation and grief.'"

Council of Constance.—Important events occurred in the Church during this reign. Neither a mad king nor princes absorbed in their mutual rivalry gave peace to Christendom. Two councils, the first under the house of Valois, were held in Paris to find means for ending the schism. France demanded and secured the summons of a general council which met at Constance in 1414 and lasted until 1418. The Popes John XXIII. and Benedict XIII. were deposed and Martin V. elected, while, to prevent a new schism, it was proclaimed that general councils were superior to the pope. At the same time the council showed its hatred for heresy by condemning John Hus and Jerome of Prague, who were burned alive. John Gerson, chancellor of the University of Paris and possibly the author of the famous *Imitation of Christ*, another Frenchman, the Cardinal-Bishop of Cambrai, and Peter d'Ailly, the *Hammer of the Heretics*, were the lights of the council.

CHAPTER XXXII

CHARLES VII.: TO HIS RE-ENTRY INTO PARIS (1422–1436)

Henry VI. and Charles VII.—On November 10, 1422, the corpse of Charles VI. was laid with little pomp in the crypt of St. Denis and the French king-at-arms cried over the royal tomb, "God behold with mercy the soul of the most high and excellent prince, Charles, King of France, the sixth of that name, our natural and sovereign lord." Then he added, "God give long life to Henry, by the grace of God King of France and of England, our sovereign lord." About the same time, at Méhun-sur-Yèvre, in Berry, some French knights raised the royal banner, crying, "Long live King Charles, the seventh of that name, by the grace of God King of France."

The king proclaimed at St. Denis was a child of nine months, grandson of Charles VI. on his mother's side, and the government was carried on in his name by two of his uncles, by the Duke of

Bedford in France and by the Duke of Gloucester in England. This child was recognised as sovereign of the kingdom of France by the university, by the first prince of the blood, Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy, by Queen Isabella of Bavaria. Paris, the Ile de France, Picardy, Artois, Flanders, Champagne, and Normandy, almost all France north of the Loire, and Guienne, south of that river, obeyed him.

The king proclaimed in Berry was the only surviving son of Charles VI., a young man of nineteen, of gracious appearance but weak in body, pale, of little courage, and constantly in fear of a violent death. For the rest, adds Chastelain, he was a good Latinist, a good talker, and very wise in council. The last quality appeared later; for the moment and for many long years he showed zeal only for pleasure and displayed lassitude in the face of perils and in dealing with affairs of state. His authority was only recognised in Touraine, the Orléanais, Berry, Bourbonnais, Auvergne, Languedoc, Dauphiné, and Lyonnais.

Inertia of the King of Bourges: Moral Power of the King of France.—Two successive defeats, at Cravant in 1423 and at Verneuil in 1424, inaugurated the reign of Charles VII. and sufficed to destroy all his hopes in northern France. He seemed to be indifferent to this fact; his enemies nicknamed him in contempt the King of Bourges and he submitted to that position. He had removed his council, parliament, and university to Poitiers, but even the towns of Bourges and Poitiers were too large for him. He held his little court from castle to castle, giving all power to the Sieur de Giac, le Camus de Beaulieu, and the Sieur de la Tremoille; submitting willingly to the all-powerful influence of his mother-in-law, Yolande of Sicily. Yet even in this precarious situation he was a source of danger to the English.

Despite his weakness, the King of Bourges had an advantage. He was a French prince, whereas his rival was a foreigner. A pamphlet by Alan Chartier showed France urging her three children, the clergy, the knights, and the people, to forget their discords and unite to save her, to save themselves. Many began to agree with the young poet. The more that was seen of the English the more the severity of their rule and the shame of that disgraceful agreement which had delivered France over to them was felt. A French prince, the Duke of Alençon, taken prisoner at Verneuil, refused to buy his liberty by subscribing to the Treaty of Troyes. The marriage of Charles VII. with Marie of

Anjou attached that powerful family to his cause and through it the brave house of Lorraine, the courageous princes of which, always French at heart, had fallen at Crecy, Nicopolis, Agincourt, everywhere where France had fought. The Count of Foix, Governor of Languedoc, after having closely questioned the lawyers and after having carefully considered the probable turn of future events, declared that his conscience forced him to recognise Charles VII. as lawful king. The constable's sword was given to Arthur de Richmont, which reconciled the Duke of Brittany, John VI., with France and secured for the prince that supply of brave soldiers and capable leaders which that warlike province was long to furnish. Castille supplied ships with which the Norman Braquemont defeated an English fleet in 1419; these same vessels brought from Scotland five or six thousand soldiers who defeated their hereditary foes at Baugé.

Thus, even in the hands of the indolent Charles VII. the monarchy revived and attracted to itself all the French spirit in the country and all that was hostile to England abroad. The prince, by removing from his council, at the request of Richmont, Tanneguy Duchâtel and the Armagnacs who had been compromised in the affair of Montereau, prepared the way for a reconciliation with those whom the death of John the Fearless had thrown into the arms of the English.

Growing Disagreement between the English and the Duke of Burgundy.—The situation of the English was complicated by unforeseen difficulties. The alliance with Burgundy had given them Paris and the Treaty of Troyes; it was of paramount necessity that the duke should be conciliated. Bedford, regent in France, understood this fact and made it the keynote of his policy. But Gloucester, regent in England, refused to follow his brother's lead. He married Jacqueline, Countess of Hainault, Holland, Zeeland, and Friesland, who was already the wife of the Duke of Brabant, and this union led to a private war between Gloucester, who had contracted the marriage for the sake of a rich inheritance, and the Duke of Burgundy, who, being already master of Flanders, realised that this same inheritance was too near his own dominions to allow it to fall into the possession of an English duke.

Siege of Montargis (1427).—Some years passed without either party delivering any grave blows. In 1427 the English, in order to reach the Loire, laid siege with 3000 men to Montargis on the Loing. The town had only a small garrison under the brave

La Faille, but the soldiers were well seconded by the inhabitants. They defended themselves for three months, at the end of which time they informed the king that they had neither provisions nor munitions. Dunois and La Hire set out with 1600 men to attempt the forcing of an entry into the place. On the way La Hire met a priest and sought absolution from him. "Confess first," said the priest. "I have no time, for I must fall upon the English; but I have done all that a man of war is wont to do." The chaplain gave him absolution such as it was. La Hire, content, fell on his knees by the roadside and uttered this prayer, "God, I pray thee that to-day thou wilt do for La Hire that which thou wouldst have La Hire do for thee, if he were God and thou wert La Hire." There was not much ritual in this, but the knight was pressed for time. Having satisfied his conscience, as he felt, he fell bravely on the English, who were forced to raise the siege.

Siege of Orleans (1428–1429): Battle of the Herrings (1429).— A year later, Bedford resolved to press forward military operations with vigour. In June the Earl of Salisbury landed at Calais with 6000 men, the best available English troops, and was joined by Bedford with 4000 soldiers drawn from the garrisons of Normandy. This army took Jargeau, Janville, Meung-sur-Loire, Thoury, Beaugency, Marchemois, La Ferté Hubert, and gradually approached Orleans.

Orleans is the gate of Berry, Bourbonnais, and Poitou. If it were taken, the King of Bourges would become the King of Languedoc and Dauphiné. On October 12, 1428, the English appeared before the walls and began to construct siege works round the town, the command of which was entrusted to the bravest leaders of their army, such as William de la Pole, Earl of Suffolk; Talbot, the English Achilles; and William Glasdale, who vowed that he would kill all the population of Orleans. Salisbury was commander-in-chief.

The people of Orleans, having expected this siege, fortified the main part of the town, burning the suburbs. Their commander was the Sieur de Gaucourt, whom the English had held captive for thirteen years because he had obstinately defended Harfleur against them, when the inhabitants had opened the gates. The garrison was only 500 men at most, but they were all veterans. The burghers further rendered valuable aid. They formed thirty-four companies and each was charged with the defence of one of the thirty-four towers on the walls.

Artillery had now begun to play a great part in battles and

sieges. The besiegers were ill-equipped in this respect, and the burghers were delighted at the inaccuracy of the English gunners, who hurled eighty-pound cannon balls into the place and killed no one. The artillery of Orleans was very different. The town had seventy pieces of ordnance and twelve master gunners who directed the fire. Each cannon had its name and its special duty. The good cannon Riflard killed its man at each shot. Master John and his culverin also did tremendous execution. The gun was fixed on a light carriage and the English found it playing everywhere, killing their leaders, the Lord Grey one day, the marshal of the camp another. The English gunners directed all their efforts against this piece, and John fell. He was clearly dead; he was carried away on a bier, and the English rejoiced. An instant later, John and his culverin reappeared with even better effect. A schoolboy, during the dinner hour, found on the ramparts a cannon already loaded; he fired it and fled from fear. The ball struck the Earl of Salisbury full in the face as he had mounted one of the siege towers and as William Glasdale was saying to him, "My lord, you see your city." The English leader died, and the next day the bastard of Orleans, the handsome and brave Dunois, of whom the fair Valentine had said, "He has disarmed me," entered the place with the best knights of the time, La Hire, Xaintrailles, Marshal Boussac, and six or seven hundred soldiers. Others followed, and by degrees the garrison was raised to 7000 men.

But the shrewd blows and jests of the Orleanists did not disturb English perseverance. Each week the besiegers added a new tower to the ring of works which they had made, aiming at encircling the whole place and reducing it by famine. Four months had already passed and food was much reduced in the town; the work of revictualling became urgent, while it was also necessary to prevent the arrival of supplies for the English, who were known to be suffering from shortness of provisions. The Duke of Bedford despatched from Paris, under the command of Sir John Falstaff, 300 waggons of munitions, of food, and especially of herrings, guarded by 2500 soldiers. The Count of Clermont, eldest son of the Duke of Bourbon, undertook to intercept this convoy. He gathered a force of 5000 men, in which figured the flower of the nobility, all the chivalry of Auvergne, Bourbonnais, and Berry, and lay in wait for the English convoy. He met it near Rouvray (February 12, 1429).

At the approach of the French, Falstaff made a barricade of

the waggons which he was convoying, placed his archers on them, and blocked the gaps between the waggons with barbed sticks. The French halted, their cavalry remained mounted in position, while their artillery, covered by their archers and infantry, opened fire on the English barricade. Soon a number of waggons were overturned or broken in pieces along with the archers who garrisoned them, and large breaches exposed the interior of the barricade to view. If the battle had gone on in this way, the little English army would have been lost, but the knights did not wish to leave all the honour to the artillery. They dismounted, despite their heavy armour, and without orders advanced upon the English. Forthwith the archers regained the advantage and forced the French to retire. The field of battle was strewn with herrings which fell out of the cases broken by the bullets. The people of Orleans consoled themselves for their misfortune by a jest, calling the encounter the Battle of the Herrings.

But the situation of the town grew daily more grave, and Charles VII. did not rouse himself from his indolence. The nobles had illustrated at Rouvray once and for all the degree of skill which they had in battle. The Count of Clermont, who was responsible for the defeat, shamefully left the town with the 2000 men whom he commanded. The Admiral of France, the Chancellor of France, the Archbishop of Reims, and the Bishop of Orleans had anticipated this conduct, despite the prayers of the citizens who tried to hold them back. The besieged began to despair. They humbly represented to the Duke of Bedford that their town was in the appanage of the Duke of Orleans, who had been a captive in England since Agincourt and who had adhered to the Treaty of Troyes, so that there was no ground for despoiling him. The English made no answer to this appeal to their generosity, and the citizens turned to the Duke of Burgundy, begging him to take their town and to protect it. Philip the Good willingly agreed to this, and entered into negotiations with the Duke of Bedford. He replied coldly that he was not inclined to act as beater for another to collect the game.

Revival of National Sentiment.—That which the nobles could not do, the lower class accomplished. The humiliation of France and of her king began to weigh on the minds of the people. Up to that time, a man had been a citizen of his town and no more ; in face of English attacks, they felt that all were Frenchmen. No one, a century earlier, had been disturbed about the siege of Calais by Edward III. : all France was interested in the fate

of Orleans. Angers, Tours, and Bourges sent provisions; Poitiers and La Rochelle sent money, the Bourbonnais, Auvergne, and Languedoc sent saltpetre, sulphur, and steel.

This sentiment had been unknown in the Middle Ages, and was destined to play a great part in modern society; patriotism was born at this time. In the journal of a Paris burgher, about 1418 – 1421, the following passage occurs: "Throughout Paris sad lamentations might be heard, little children crying, 'I am dying of hunger.' Crowded round a stove, thirty children, boys and girls, might be found perishing of hunger and cold. They died so rapidly that it was necessary to dig great pits in the cemeteries, in which they threw them by thirties and forties at a time, sprinkling a little earth over them and packing them like bacon. The gravediggers declared that they interred more than 100,000 persons. The cobblers, on the day of their guild meeting, estimated the deaths in their fraternity, and found that they were over 1800, both masters and men, in these two months. Bands of wolves scoured the countryside, and at night even entered the city to carry off the corpses. Labourers left their fields, saying, 'Let us fly to the woods with the wild beasts. Adieu, wives and children. Let us be as evil as we can. Let us give ourselves up to the Devil.'"

If such was the state of affairs in Paris and its neighbourhood, it may be imagined what occurred in the rural districts. These miseries were due to a variety of causes, but the people knew of one cause only. All the sufferings which they endured were attributed to the English; all the hatred which they felt was directed against the English; to drive out the English was the one thought which constantly filled their minds, and as human aid failed them they counted upon God. This hope gradually spread throughout France, and the belief grew that the kingdom, betrayed by a woman, the unworthy Queen Isabella of Bavaria, would be delivered by a maid of the people, a virgin. This heroic daughter of the masses, this virgin deliverer, was Joan of Arc.

Joan of Arc (1429–1431).—Joan of Arc, the third daughter of a peasant, Jacques d'Arc, and of Isabella Rommée, was born in 1409 at the village of Domrémy, between Champagne and Lorraine. Life on this frontier was very disturbed. War was continual; sometimes the English, sometimes the Burgundians, sometimes the grand companies, spread over the land, and it was necessary to be ever ready to fight, to fly into the neighbouring forest if it was impossible to resist, returning when the enemy

had passed by to make good his ravages. The men of Domrémy were Armagnacs; two leagues from their village was Marey, the people of which were equally determined Burgundians, and the men and children of the two villages never met without fighting. Joan had often seen her three brothers return covered with blood.

War, battles, wounds, devastation, formed the first picture which greeted the eyes of Joan. At the fireside, when she stayed to knit and spin with her mother, it was still tales of war that she heard, drawn from the holy traditions, stories of St. Michael, the archangel of battles, of St. Catherine and St. Margaret, to whom the young peasant offered devoutly the crowns and garlands she had woven. She regarded them as her patron saints, dreamed of them in the oak-wood under the great beech tree of the fairies, a little way from her dwelling. In all her dreams she saw also the figure of Charles VII., that poor young king denied by his mother and expelled from his inheritance by the English.

Joan grew up, reached the age of fourteen, in the midst of all these troubles, with a strong body but an anxious mind. She was a good girl, "simple, sweet, and timid," say her contemporaries, devoted to the Church and holy places, confessing often and increasing by scourgings that exaltation of mind, that second-sight which looked beyond her surroundings and made her receive with sincere faith the visions that came to her. One day, in 1423, in the summer and on a fast day, the young girl was in the garden near the church at midday when she suddenly saw a great light, and from the midst of this light heard a voice saying, "Joan, good and wise child, go often to church." On another occasion she saw in this light beautiful figures, one of whom, who was winged, said to her, "Joan, go and deliver the King of France and restore the kingdom to him." She trembled greatly and answered, "Sir, I am but a poor maid; I know not how to lead men-at-arms." The voice replied, "St. Catherine and St. Margaret will assist you." She saw again the archangel and the two saints and heard the voices; she heard them for four years, then it was time to obey them.

But it was difficult to see how they could be obeyed. In answer to some timid suggestions, her father declared that rather than see her go away with soldiers he would kill her with his own hands. She obtained leave to be sent to Vaucouleurs to one of her uncles, André Laxart, on the ground that she would tend her aunt who was ill. Her uncle at once supported Joan's mission, and persuaded her to seek the help of the Sieur

de Baudricourt, captain of the place. Baudricourt received the messenger rudely and answered that it would be well to suppress this girl and send her back to her father. Joan was not repulsed, "For," she said, "ere mid-Lent I must be with the king, and I will be though I wear my legs to the knees." She went to the captain and succeeded. Baudricourt was not convinced, but he was forced by the people, who were filled with admiration. They combined to provide for Joan, to buy her a horse, as the captain would give her nothing but a sword. She cut her long hair, put on a man's dress, and despite the last opposition of her parents, left Vaucouleurs, under the guard of six men-at-arms, at the beginning of February, 1429.

Her journey from the banks of the Meuse to those of the Loire was terrible at such a time. Joan might have distrusted the rough guardians who had been assigned to her and have feared the brigands and the enemy. Nothing terrified her, however; she even reassured her companions, saying, "Fear nothing; God has ordained my journey, and for it was I born; my brothers in paradise tell me that I shall accomplish it." Her enthusiasm and that which she inspired in others enabled her to triumph over all difficulties and all dangers. On February 24 she reached Chinon, where Charles VII. then was. The council discussed whether the king should see her; after two days it was resolved, as things went ill at Orleans, to try any means to save that important town.

Joan was received in the midst of pomp and display which did not disconcert her. Without either timidity or boldness, she at once recognised the king, whose image had for so many years filled her thoughts. She went straight to him, though he tried to hide among the courtiers, and said, "Gentle dauphin, why do you not believe me? I tell you that God has pity on you, your kingdom, and your people, for St. Louis and St. Charlemagne are on their knees before Him praying for you. If you will lend me men I will raise the siege of Orleans and I will lead you to be consecrated at Reims, for it is the will of God that his enemies, the English, shall go back to their land and that the kingdom shall remain to you."

The sceptical court of Charles VII. was not easily convinced of the reality of a miraculous mission. It was necessary to make sure that the newcomer was not an emissary of the devil. Bishops, monks, doctors, and professors of the University of Poitiers solemnly cross-examined her. Joan was asked why, if God wished to deliver the people of France, he had need of men-at-

arms. She answered without concern, "The men-at-arms fight, but it is God that giveth the victory." Another asked if she believed in God, and added that God would not wish her words to be believed until at least she had given them some sign. "I am not come to work signs and miracles," she answered, "my sign shall be that I will raise the siege of Orleans. Only give me men-at-arms, few or many, and I will go."

It was neither the court nor the judges whom it was necessary to convince, but the people; and the people were convinced. Public opinion forced the hand of the government; Joan of Arc was equipped, armed, and sent, or as she said *called*, to Orleans.

Relief of Orleans (May 8, 1429).—Orleans was in great danger, but it must be added that the English besiegers were also in a perilous situation. The fatigues of a long winter siege, the losses sustained in battle and desertion, had greatly weakened their army; the Duke of Burgundy, wounded by the conduct of the Duke of Bedford towards him, had recalled his troops, and the English army was reduced to four or five thousand men, dispersed in a dozen siege towers which were not connected with each other.

Discipline and union in the attacking forces were alone needed to reduce so feeble an enemy. For the time being there was nothing more disorderly than the bands of adventurers who had thrown themselves into the town to defend it and who saw in war only profit and pleasure. The prayer of La Hire has already been mentioned; on another occasion he said, "If God the Father became a soldier, he would also without a doubt become a robber." To make *morale* and to discipline these rude and savage natures was in itself an enterprise beyond the power of royal authority at this time, and Charles VII. only attempted it with danger to himself ten years later. But what the monarchy could not do, general enthusiasm performed. On a sign from Joan of Arc, they renounced their orgies, went to confession, and took the communion. La Hire ceased to swear by his baton. The army, transformed, became invincible.

On April 29, 1429, Joan entered Orleans with a convoy of provisions and a weak escort; on May 4 she brought in an army, which was halted at Blois, passing and repassing the besiegers' lines without moving the English. Beside the fact that they were actually weak, the English believed that all the powers of hell were leagued against them. Joan, who was a saint within the walls of Orleans, was a sorceress in the English

lines; the besiegers heaped gross insults on her, calling her a cowherd, a wanton, and other names, and yet fearing her power. As a sorceress, they thought she could perform miracles, and in their opinion only by a miracle could they have been filled with such abject terror. The famed English soldiers themselves evacuated their works south of the Loire, with the exception of two, in which they concentrated all their forces, those of the Augustines and the Tournelles.

These two fortresses intercepted communications between the town and Berry and it was resolved to attack them. On May 6 Joan crossed the Loire, advanced against the tower of the Augustines, rallied her men who were about to fly in a panic of terror, planted her standard, bearing the fleur-de-lys, on the ditch, and the work was taken, burned, and destroyed. Next day, May 7, the whole army and people attacked Tournelles. Joan was the first to place a ladder against the rampart; she mounted it and was severely wounded, but this merely animated her soldiers. Assailed on all sides, the English tried in vain to escape; the famous captain, William Glasdale, fell armed into the river and was drowned; 500 of his men perished. Tournelles was taken, and not an Englishman remained south of the Loire. Next day, May 8, Suffolk and Talbot evacuated the northern works, abandoning munitions, artillery, baggage, and wounded prisoners. Orleans still celebrates the day of its deliverance.

The soldiers and the whole population of Orleans wished to pursue the English, but Joan forbade it. "Let them go," she said, "do not pursue them or kill them; to-day is the Sabbath."

On May 13 she left Orleans to seek the king at Tours. As soon as she saw him, she curtsied gracefully and embracing him by the knees said, "Gentle dauphin, do not hold so many long councils, but come to receive the crown at Reims. I am eager that you should go there and I doubt not that there you will receive your worthy consecration."

Battle of Patay (1429): Charles VII. crowned at Reims.—If Charles VII. could be crowned at Reims he would gain a decisive victory over his young rival, Henry VI., and become truly King of France. In view of the depression with which the English were filled, the expedition was certainly less dangerous than it appeared. But the politicians again believed that they were wiser than Joan and insisted that it was essential the English should first be driven from the banks of the Loire. Jargeau, Beaugeny, and Meung-sur-Loire were taken and a battle was fought four or five miles from Patay. The English were sur-

prised; they showed neither the coolness nor the prudence which they usually displayed and 2500 men were killed. Falstaff fled; the invincible Talbot and Lord Scales were taken prisoners.

After this further victory the advice of Joan was necessarily taken. The people believed in her alone; even the nobles rallied round her. It was said that as the king could give only three francs to each man for the whole campaign, "Those gentlemen who were unable to mount and arm themselves went as archers and swordsmen mounted on horses."

The French left Gien on June 28, 1429. The army was joyfully received by the peasants in the hamlets and villages. The towns hesitated. Auxerre, which belonged to the Duke of Burgundy, would not open its gates, but supplied provisions and promised to recognise Charles as soon as Troyes, Châlons, and Reims had submitted.

Troyes was strongly garrisoned by Burgundians and English, and as the walls were in good state it declined to admit the royal army. There was nothing for it but to undertake a siege, although the whole artillery force consisted of a single bomb thrower and the army was short of food, the soldiers having subsisted for five or six days on roots which they gathered in the fields. The assembled council anxiously debated; Joan assured them that they would be in the town in three days. "We could well wait six," they answered, "if we could be sure that your words would come true." "Six?" she cried. "Well, you shall enter the town to-day." She ran to the ramparts, her standard in hand; she caused the ditch to be filled and began to attack the wall. The English, alarmed by the fate of Orleans, themselves offered to evacuate the town.

Charles only passed by Troyes, and was not delayed at Châlons which readily opened its gates. On July 13 he arrived before Reims. Two Burgundian lords, the Sieur de Chatillon and the Sieur de Saveuse, were in command, but they had no soldiers. They assembled the burghers and asked them to hold out for six weeks, at the end of which time they declared that the Dukes of Burgundy and Bedford would arrive with an army so powerful that the siege would be easily raised. The burghers refused to run this risk, persuaded the two captains to retire, and sent a deputation to the Chancellor of France, who was also Archbishop of Reims, begging him to enter his episcopal seat. On July 17 Charles was at last crowned at Reims according to the ancient ceremonial.

Continuation of the War against the English.—Joan had

accomplished the two great deeds which her voices had bidden her perform ; she had relieved Orleans and she had caused the king to be crowned. She sighed to return to her village. At her entry into Reims, says the chronicler, "When she saw the poor people of the land crying Noël and weeping for joy and gladness, and when they went before the king chanting the *Te Deum*, she said to the Chancellor of France and to Count Dunois, 'In the name of God, here is a good people and devout, and when I come to die, I would fain die in this land.' Then Count Dunois asked her, 'Joan, do you know when you will die and where?' She answered that she was in God's hand, and said to the other lord, 'I have done what the Lord commanded me, and now I greatly wish to return to my father and mother and to look after their flocks and herds.'" But her part was not yet played, for the English still held a considerable part of the kingdom. Joan, with the same resolution which had led to such success at Orleans and Reims, demanded an immediate advance against Paris. The king's advisers could not accustom themselves to such heroic measures—which are at times superior to prudent counsels ; they resolved to take the small places which lay near Paris. These towns opened their gates of their own accord, and the royal army entered without opposition into Laon, Soissons, Coulommiers, Provins, Château-Thierry, Compiègne, Beauvais, Senlis, St. Denis. But when it arrived before Paris the chance was lost.

Paris was too large a town to be carried by a sudden attack, and the Parisians were too deeply involved in the recent revolutions to surrender to Charles VII. without absolute necessity. They had had time to recover from the astonishment created by the coronation at Reims and had prepared for defence. They offered a brave resistance. Joan conducted the attack with her accustomed courage ; she crossed the trench around the city and was wounded by an arrow which pierced her leg. Nevertheless she incurred all the blame for this attempt and saw Charles VII. falling back into his old indolence, returning to Chinon, in order to be behind the barrier of the Loire, and leaving an order for the evacuation of St. Denis. She saw the Duke of Burgundy regain his courage, recover Soissons, and besiege Compiègne. Joan was touched by the fate of these poor burghers, who had given themselves up to Charles VII., and threw herself into the town to defend it.

Captivity and Death of Joan of Arc (1430–1431).—On the very day of her arrival, May 24, 1430, she made a *sortie*, but the

besiegers repulsed it and when she regained the gate she found it shut. Abandoned in the midst of her enemies, she was thrown from her horse by a Picard archer and taken by the bastard of Vendôme, who sold her to John of Luxemburg. John, in order to gain peacefully, and to the prejudice of his elder brother, the lordships of Ligny and St. Pol, needed the help of the Duke of Burgundy. The Duke of Burgundy, that he might not be disturbed while he appropriated Brabant, Brussels, and Louvain, despite the claims of his aunt Margaret, needed the help of the English. The English were inclined to allow anything, provided that Joan of Arc was handed over to them. They paid 10,000 francs for the person of the Maid of France.

To the French, Joan was the messenger of God; to the English she was the messenger of the devil. Peter Cauchon, Bishop of Beauvais, a violent man who was ready to do anything in order to secure the see of Reims, undertook to prove a charge of sorcery in proper legal form. He based the accusation on four points: that despite the laws of the Church Joan had practised magical arts; that she had taken arms despite the prohibition of her parents; that she wore clothes which were not those of her sex; and that she had professed to have received revelations not sanctioned by ecclesiastical authority. A poor girl of nineteen thus found herself opposed, without help, to judges sold to her enemies, who arbitrarily suppressed evidence of her innocence, forbade her to appeal to pope or council, tried to confuse her with absurd, captious, or infinitely delicate questions, and who yet found themselves nonplussed by her brave answers.

She was asked if she believed herself to be in a state of grace. She answered, "If I am not, may God bring me to it; if I am, may God keep me therein." "Did you not say that standards made by soldiers in imitation of yours would bring good luck?" "No; I said only, 'Attack the English boldly and I will enter the battle myself.'" She added that she had slain no one. Asked why her standard was carried into the church of Reims at the coronation before that of the captains, she replied that it had been through the heat of the day and deserved to be honoured. She was asked what was in the minds of the men who kissed her hands, feet, and clothes. She said that they came willingly to her because she had done them no harm, but had sustained and defended them with all her might. Did she believe that she might leave her father and mother without their consent? Ought she not to honour her father and mother?

She replied that they had forgiven her. Did she think that she had not sinned in acting as she had done? She answered that God commanded her; if she had had a hundred fathers and mothers, she would have done the same. Did she believe that her king had done right in killing, or in causing to be killed, the Duke of Burgundy? "It was a great injury to the realm of France, but the matter was their concern; God had sent her to save the King of France." Did St. Catherine and St. Margaret hate the English? She replied that they loved whom God loved and hated whom God hated. Did God hate the English? "I know nothing as to the love or hate that God has for the English, but I know well that they will soon be driven out of France, save those who die there."

The judges harped on the male garments that Joan had worn, contrary to the laws of the Church, which she still wore, and which she was unwilling to abandon. The villains pretended not to understand what the poor girl dared not say to them, that in the camp and in the prison itself, these clothes had been and were still her safeguard.

Her condemnation had been resolved beforehand, but it was well to win from her some remark which might injure Charles VII., and all means were employed for this purpose. Threats had little effect on that brave heart; recourse was had to promises, to the most dangerous of temptations for her, the offer that she should be taken from the hands of her English gaolers and handed over to the custody of the Church. She gave way, and without understanding its meaning signed the recantation which was presented to her; then by an exhibition of grace and moderation she was condemned only to imprisonment for life, to the bread and water of affliction, that she might lament her sins.

It was then that the English complained. Their fortunes went from bad to worse. An expedition against Dauphiné failed; Xaintrailles, Boussac, Vendôme, and Barbasan beat the Burgundians and their allies in Champagne and Picardy. The movement begun by Joan continued. As there were more blows to bear and less booty to receive, the English recruits were less anxious to cross the sea and the invaders were the more embittered against Joan. At Rouen, Lord Warwick said loudly, "The king paid dearly for her; he wished her to die by a judicial sentence and meant her to be burned; we shall know how to gain possession of her again." And they did regain possession of her. On Trinity Sunday, when she should have

been handed over, one of the English who guarded her took her woman's dress away and left her only male clothes. She told him that she was forbidden, as he knew, to wear them. They would give her no others, and she had to put them on. The judges were well prepared to witness the crime; they condemned her as relapsed, and sentenced her to be burned alive, the execution being fixed to take place at once.

On the morning, Cauchon sent a confessor, Brother Martin l'Advenu, to announce her fate and to bring her to repent. When he told the poor girl of the death which she was to die that day, she began to weep piteously and to tear her hair. "Alas, that I should be treated so horribly and cruelly, that my body, which I have ever kept pure, should be burned and reduced to ashes. I would rather be beheaded seven times than be burned once. I call upon God, the great judge of wrongs and of pitiless deeds." It was nine o'clock when she was again dressed in her woman's clothes and placed on a waggon. Until then the maid had never despaired. She said often that the English would kill her, but in her heart she had not believed it. She did not imagine that she could be abandoned to her fate; she believed in her king and in the good people of France. She said expressly, "In the prison or at the judgment there will be some difficulty by which I shall be delivered to great victory." But when the king and the people failed her, she had another resource, the powerful and certain help of her heavenly friends, her good and dear saints. At the siege of St. Pierre, when her men abandoned her, the saints sent an invisible army to her aid. They could not abandon their obedient daughter, to whom they had so often promised safety and deliverance.

Her thoughts may be imagined when she found that she was really to die, when mounted on her waggon she passed through the crowd, under the guard of 800 English armed with swords and lances. She wept and lamented, but accused neither the king nor her saints. Only one remark she made, "O Rouen, Rouen, am I then to die here?"

The end of her sad journey was the Vieux Marché, the fish market. Three scaffolds had been erected. On one was an episcopal and royal chair, the throne of the Cardinal of England, among the seats of his suffragans. On another sat the actors in the sad drama, the preacher, judges, and bailiff; and on the third was the prisoner. Near by was a great scaffold covered by layers of wood; its height was alarming. This was not merely intended to make the scene more impressive. It was designed

also in order that, owing to the height of the stake, the torch should be applied only to the bottom, that the duration of the execution might not be shortened or death hastened by the victim being set on fire at once. There was to be no opportunity for justice to be defeated by the burning of a dead body; Joan was to be really burned alive, while, placed at the top of this pile, she would be observed by all, ringed in as she was by armed soldiers. Slowly and gradually she was to be burned under the eyes of a curious crowd; it was easy to believe that she would display some weakness, that some word, which might be taken as a recantation, would escape her, perhaps some muttered prayer, some humble cry for pardon such as a lost girl might utter.

The terrible ceremony began with a sermon. Master Nicholas Midy, one of the lights of the University of Paris, preached on the edifying text, "When a member of the Church is ill, all the Church is ill." The poor Church could be cured only by the cutting off of the member. He ended with the formula, "Joan, depart in peace, the Church can no more defend you."

The Church's judge, the Bishop of Beauvais, then gently exhorted her to concern herself with her soul and to recall all her misdeeds, that she might be moved to penitence. His assessors had assured him that it was right for him to read again Joan's recantation; he did not do so. He feared an uproar, protests. But the poor girl would scarcely have so played with her life; she had other thoughts. Even before she had been exhorted to repent, she had fallen on her knees, invoking God, the Virgin, St. Catherine, and St. Michael, pardoning all and asking pardon, saying to those by her, "Pray for me." She especially asked the priests each to say a mass for her soul. So devout, humble, and touching was her attitude that emotion grew and no one could restrain himself; the Bishop of Beauvais began to weep, while the Bishop of Boulogne sobbed; even the English were moved to tears, the cardinal amongst them.

But the judges, though for a moment disconcerted, soon regained their composure, and the Bishop of Beauvais, wiping his eyes, began to read Joan's condemnation. He recalled to the mind of the victim all her crimes, schism, idolatry, invocation of demons, how she had been admitted to repentance and how, seduced by the prince of lies, she had relapsed, "Alas! as a dog returns to his vomit. Therefore we pronounce that you are a diseased member, and as such must be cut off from the

Church. We deliver you to the secular arm, praying it none the less to be lenient to you, avoiding death and the mutilation of members."

Abandoned by the Church, Joan placed all her trust in God. She asked for a cross, and an Englishman handed her a cross of wood made from a stick; this she kissed and placed under her clothes on her flesh. But she still wished for the cross of the Church that she might hold it before her eyes in death. The good bailiff Massieu and Brother Isambart brought one to her from the parish church of St. Sauveur. As she embraced it and Isambart encouraged her, the English began to feel that the ceremony had gone on long enough: it was now almost midday; the soldiers grumbled and the captains asked, "What, priests? Would you have us dine here?" Then, losing patience and not waiting for the orders of the bailiff who alone had authority to send her to her death, they caused two sergeants to mount the scaffold and to remove the priests. At the foot of the tribunal Joan was seized by men-at-arms who dragged her to the stake, saying to the executioner, "Do your duty." The brutality of the soldiers horrified many of those present, including even the judges, who fled that they might see no more.

When she found herself in the square and in the hands of the English, her nature was outraged and her flesh trembled. Again she cried, "O Rouen, you are then to be my last abode!" She said no more and did not offend with her lips, even in this moment of terror and anguish. She accused neither the king nor the saints. But when she reached the top of the pyre and saw the great city and the motionless, silent crowd beneath her, she could not refrain from saying, "Ah, Rouen, Rouen! I fear greatly that you will suffer for my death."

She was bound to the stake and crowned with a mitre bearing the words, "Heretic, relapsed, apostate, idolatress." The executioner lit the fire. She saw it from above and uttered a cry. Then, as the friar urged her to pay no attention to the flame, she forgot herself, and feared for him, causing him to go down.

Proof that she had made no express recantation is afforded by the conduct of Cauchon, who felt himself obliged to go to the foot of the pyre, almost to look his victim in the face, in order that he might extract some word from her. He secured only one despairing utterance. Joan said to him with the same softness that she had used throughout, "Bishop, by your means I die; had you put me in the prisons of the Church, this would not have

come to pass." There was doubtless hope that when she saw the king had abandoned her, she would at last accuse him and speak against him. She still excused him; "What I have done, well or ill, the king has had no share in it; not by him was I advised."

The flames mounted. When they touched her, the unhappy victim groaned and demanded holy water; water appeared to be the cry of fear. But recovering at once, she afterwards only uttered the name of God, the angels, and the saints, rendering testimony to them: "Yes, my voices were from God, my voices have not deceived me."

This great saying was attested by the necessary and sworn witness of her death, the Dominican who mounted the pyre with her, whom she made go down, but who talked to her from below, heard her and held the cross towards her. We have also another witness of this holy death; a witness of great weight, who was himself a true saint. This witness, whose name has been handed down in history, is the Augustinian monk, Brother Isambart de la Pierre.

Twenty years later, the two venerable brothers, simple monks, vowed to poverty and having nothing either to gain or to fear in this world, deposed that they heard her in the fire invoking her saints and her archangel. She repeated the Saviour's name, and finally, bowing her head, uttered one loud cry, "Jesus."

Ten thousand men wept. Some of the English laughed or tried to laugh. One of them, one of the most furious, had sworn that he would put a faggot on the fire. She died at the moment when he did so, and he was miserable. His comrades took him to a tavern to drink that he might regain his spirits. But he could not do so; "I saw," he said, despite himself, "I saw, as she breathed her last, a dove come from her mouth." Others saw in the flames the word she had last uttered, "Jesus." In the evening Brother Isambart was visited by the executioner; he was filled with terror and confessed; he could not believe that God had pardoned him. One of the English king's secretaries said aloud, as he turned away, "We are lost; we have burned a saint."

Reverses of the English: Coronation of Henry VI. at Paris (1431).—The "sorceress," the "she-devil," was burned; the charm would doubtless be broken, the witchcraft dispelled, and nothing would prevent the English from conquering the kingdom of France. But before they insisted on their new material superiority, they considered that it would be well to secure moral superiority and to regularise the title of Henry VI. by having

him crowned. The coronation, to which a "devil" had led Charles VII., was by the fact of her presence null and void, and the English wished to confer on their young king an orthodox and unimpeachable coronation. But it proved to be a disappointment. The ceremony took place (December 16, 1431), not at Reims, which the English did not hold, but at Paris. An English prelate officiated, the Cardinal of Winchester, to the great discontent of the Bishop of Paris; English peers were present, but not a single French prince; there was no freeing of prisoners, no reduction of taxation, no *largesse* to the people. "A burgher, marrying his children, does things better," said the city.

General discontent resulted from the ceremony which was designed to make Henry VI. popular, and the English were left to hope that they might recover their former good fortune in war.

They failed, however, to take Compiègne; it resisted for six months and was then relieved; Marshal Boussac almost took Rouen, his advance-guard being already in the castle when his soldiers quarrelled over the division of the spoils, which they had not yet secured, and all was lost (1432). Dunois had more success at Chartres. He had heard that a certain famous preacher would deliver a sermon in a given church on a certain day; all the garrison were devoutly present at the service, and during its progress the French took the town. The English, who lost this important point, were unable even to capture a hamlet. A certain French captain, John Foucault, posted himself at Ligny and disturbed the suburbs of Paris. Bedford and Warwick marched in full array to besiege this small place. They assembled much artillery, effected a breach, and then, through the open gap, saw the garrison waiting bravely for them. They retired to Paris, where they arrived on Easter Eve, "apparently for confession," says the Paris burgher sarcastically in his journal. Meanwhile, the soldiers of fortune in the service of France took St. Valery, Gerberoy, Denis, and other places.

Rupture of the Anglo-Burgundian Alliance.—The English, everywhere unfortunate, had all the more need of their Burgundian alliance, but Philip the Good had secured possession of some correspondence between the two brothers, Bedford and Gloucester. The latter suggested the arrest of the Duke of Burgundy, while the former contended that it would be better to put him to death and that the murder could be committed without danger, that he could be removed, for example, at Paris at a tournament to which he had been invited. In the meantime,

the dukes wrote to the people of Ghent urging them to revolt and offering them English support. The Duchess of Bedford, sister of Philip the Good, prevented an immediate rupture, but she died in November, 1432.

Every error which the English committed was skilfully exploited by the Breton Constable Richmont, who had then complete control of the affairs of the French court. His sane policy consisted in effecting a reconciliation between France and Burgundy, turning the Treaty of Troyes against the English. It appeared to be an easy matter for Philip the Good to change his attitude; grievances were not wanting, but a species of chivalrous loyalty to ungrateful friends impelled the Burgundian duke to decline to take part in any negotiations which had not the restoration of a general peace for their object. A real European congress was therefore summoned to meet at Arras in 1435.

Treaty of Arras (1435).—On the appointed day representatives of all the Christian states met at Arras; ambassadors of the pope, the emperor, the Kings of Castille, Navarre, Arragon, Portugal, Sicily, Naples, Cyprus, Poland, and Denmark, of the good cities of the realm and of the University. The Constable Richmont and eighteen great lords represented the King of France, while the Cardinal of Winchester and a number of lords represented the King of England. And the Duke of Burgundy was also present.

The conference opened on August 5, 1435, in the chapel of St. Wast, and the English at first demanded the execution pure and simple of the Treaty of Troyes. They then asked for the *status quo*, and as they were offered only Normandy and Aquitaine in full sovereignty, they left Arras on September 6. Every one then asked the Duke of Burgundy to make his peace with the King of France. He had his scruples; he had sworn to avenge the death of his father. The cardinal legates who presided at the assembly volunteered to release him at once from so evil an oath. The duke had signed the Treaty of Troyes. The lawyers affirmed that the treaty was void, since Roman law prohibited dealing with the succession of a living man. In the midst of the discussions Bedford died. Philip forthwith believed himself to be free from all ties, and signed (September 21, 1435) the Treaty of Arras. It was agreed "that the king should declare, or that one of his chief men should be empowered to declare, to the Duke of Burgundy that the death of the duke's father, John, whom God absolve, was wholly and entirely accomplished by the actual

doers of the deed and by evil counsel; that the king had always deplored the event and did deplore it with all his heart; that if he had been of age and of such understanding as he now was, he would have prevented it with all his might, but that he was very young, he had little knowledge, and he was not made aware that he had the power. And the king prayed the duke that he would put out of his heart all hatred and rancour which he felt on account of that event and that peace and love should exist between them."

"For the soul of the said Lord John, Duke of Burgundy, foundations and buildings should be established; in the church of Montereau, in which the corpse of the said duke was first interred, a chapel should be built, and a perpetual chaplain appointed to say a requiem mass each day for ever; the chapel should be endowed suitably with 60 livres a year. In the same town of Montereau, or as near it as should seem well, there should be built and completed by the king at his own expense a church, convent, and monastery which were to be endowed with good revenues, sufficient to bring in the sum of 800 livres a year. On the bridge of Montereau, where the evil deed was done, there should be erected and maintained for ever at the king's expense a fair cross, such as the Cardinal of St. Croix and his commissary should decide. In the church of Chartreux-les-Dijon, where the body of Duke John was interred, the king should found and pay for a high mass to be said daily in perpetuity, endowed with a revenue of 100 livres a year sufficiently secured."

More material satisfaction was also accorded to the duke. He was ceded the counties of Auxerre and Macon in perpetuity, the castles of Peronne, Roye, and Montdidier, and under power of redemption the Somme towns St. Quentin, Corbie, Amiens, Abbeville, and St. Valery. He received the reversion of Artois, exemption during their joint lives of homage to the king and from all other duties, so that he became really an independent sovereign in his own demesnes.

Charles VII. at Paris (1436).—These concessions were hard and humiliating, but they at once brought their compensation, as the Treaty of Arras gave Paris to the King of France. The burghers invited Richmont and opened the gate St. Jacques to him (May 29, 1436). Lord Willoughby and the fifteen hundred Englishmen who garrisoned Paris shut themselves up in the Bastille. Richmont was anxious to take them, as he estimated the ransom of these lords to be worth at least 200,000 livres, but he

had received no supplies from the king for his expedition and was without any siege requisites. The English offered to surrender the Bastille on condition that they should be allowed to retire with their goods and that such as wished might be allowed to follow them. This capitulation was accepted; the English marched out by the St. Antoine gate, went round the walls amid the hoots of the people, and embarked on the Seine for Rouen.

EIGHTH PERIOD—FINAL VICTORY OF THE MONARCHY OVER THE FEUDAL ARISTOCRACY

(1436-1491)

CHAPTER XXXIII

EXPULSION OF THE ENGLISH FROM FRANCE AND THE GOVERNMENT OF CHARLES VII. (1436–1461)

Situation of the Kingdom.—Some time after the surrender of Paris, Charles VII. visited the capital. Pestilence still raged there; 5000 people had died in the hospitals, 45,000 in the city, and half of these of hunger rather than of disease. The *Burgeois de Paris* says that when death visited a house it carried off the majority of the inmates, and especially the young and vigorous. The streets were so deserted that wolves entered the city to carry off dogs and young children; fourteen persons were eaten by them in a week of September, 1438. All at once the people who had produced Marcel and Joan of Arc, and who in the general disorder had become habituated to arms and affairs, began to acquire great weight in the state, whereas two centuries earlier they had been of no importance.

Above the burghers were the remnants of the old feudal aristocracy, the character of which had been greatly changed by a century of constant civil and foreign war. The government, the action of which had been so long suspended, was not more concerned in the armies than the rest of the country. It supplied neither pay, nor food, nor munitions; the soldier had to live by the profits of war, at the cost of the enemy if he could, but more often at the cost of the country. The army was without control, without discipline; it recognised no sovereign but its commander, no law but his will. Those who bore arms received the significant titles of *houspileurs*, *écorcheurs*, *retondeurs*.[1] Their leaders, who deserve honour as the defenders

[1] These terms are untranslatable: they mean, literally, *abusers*, *extortioners*, *turncoats*.

of France against the foreigner, such men as Etienne de Vignoles, Jean de la Roche, Antoine de Chabannes, Guillaume de Flavy, were cruel and fierce, rough to their enemies, but not less rough towards the peasants and burghers, maltreating the one no less than the other.

While the war produced these lamentable results, it was not the army alone that was corrupted, but a whole class of men, all those who were called gentlemen and who carried a sword. The manners of the camp extended to the castles. John of Luxemburg, in order to teach his nephew the young Count de St. Pol the art of war, entrusted to him the killing of twenty-four prisoners, a task in which he took great delight. The Duke of Brittany put his brother to death, the Duke of Guelders killed his father, the Sieur de Giac his wife, the Countess of Foix her sister, the King of Aragon his son. Giles de Retz carried off children from the country and towns in order to kill them at pleasure and to practise magical arts. This state of things lasted for fourteen years, and at the fortress of Chantocé, where de Retz lived, a full *tonne* of calcined bones was found, the remains of forty children. It is estimated that 140 were killed by this savage monster.

Above this feudal aristocracy there was another aristocracy, that of the princes, whom the crown had itself exalted by making vast appanages for the "royaux de France," as the sons, brothers, and relatives of the king were termed. Thus arose the great houses of Burgundy, Orleans, Anjou, and Bourbon, which combined a spirit of independence, such as was found in the old feudalism, with the pride and pretensions of a royal family, and one of the members of which remarked that he so loved the kingdom of France that in place of one king he would have six.

The King of Bourges, who had now become King of Paris without any great improvement in his position having been effected, found himself in the midst of this troubled society. In the twelfth century, when Louis VI. tried to produce some order in the country, the militia of the communes had rallied round his banner and had bravely assisted in the capture of Le Puiset, Corbeil, La Ferté; from this union of king and people the monarchy and kingdom of Philip the Fair had resulted. In the fifteenth century the French monarchy was restored by the same means. The people in their misery, the king in his weakness, united to secure the triumph of order and justice, to throw down by their joint efforts that aristocratic domination which opposed the unity and well-being of the realm. The king became

the chief revolutionary, for it was rather a revolution than a reform that was effected. It was a rôle which had already been played with success by Philip Augustus, St. Louis, and Philip IV.

Charles VII. proved himself to be a changed man in the second part of his reign. "The fair Agnes," says Brantôme, "seeing that Charles VII. was indolent and lazy, taking no care of his realm, told him one day that when she was still a young girl an astrologer had told her that she would be loved and served by one of the most valiant, one of the bravest kings in Christendom; when the king did her the honour to love her, she thought that he was the valorous king she had heard of. But when she saw he was so indolent, that he took little care for his affairs, she realised that she had been deceived and that the brave king was not Charles VII. but the King of England, who did such great feats of arms and took fair cities by the sword. And she told Charles she would go to seek Henry, since he was the king who had been predicted to her. These words so piqued Charles VII. that he was grieved, and from that time, taking courage and abandoning his hunting and his gardens, he took the bit between his teeth, so that by good fortune and courage he expelled the English from his realm."

Unfortunately this story, and the attractive verses which it inspired Francis I. to write, have no historical foundation. Agnes Sorel did not appear at court until some time after the relief of Orleans, and if any women exercised a salutary influence on the king they were, besides Joan of Arc, his wife Marie of Anjou, and still more his mother-in-law, Yolande of Sicily, a princess of rare energy. An attractive story is lost, but what the picturesqueness of history loses its morality gains.

Brantôme and Francis I. were in accord with the spirit and temperament of their age when they attributed the changed character of the king to the lady of Beauté. It is in accord with modern ideas to point out that Charles VII., always careless in his morals, but trained in public affairs by age and experience, was supported by wise councillors who had great influence over him. Among these advisers were Jean Bureau, his master of artillery; Jacques Cœur, master of finance; Etienne Chevalier, his secretary, who countersigned most of the great ordinances of the reign; William Cousinot, the master of requests, who was so esteemed by the king that when he was taken by the English and his ransom fixed at 20,000 gold crowns, Charles raised the *taille* (tax) by that sum

in order to pay the price. All these men were of humble birth; Agnes also was only the daughter of a burgher or of a squire. Some nobles are found in the royal council, but they belonged to the minor nobility which owed everything to royal favour, such men as Peter and John de Breze, La Hire, Pothon de Xaintrailles, Chabannes, and Dunois. Richmont was the sole exception, but the constable was rather the minister of France than of the king. He was as strong an opponent of the favourites as he was of the English, and by his rapid executions merited the title of the Justiciar. He caused the Sieur de Giac to be drowned, ran through Le Camus de Beaulieu under the eyes of the king, and wounded La Trémoille (1432).

Ordinance of Orleans (1439): The Perpetual Taille.—Reform seemed to be so urgent that its adoption was not even postponed to the end of the war. In October, 1439, Charles assembled the States-General of the north at Orleans, and asked them to aid him in the difficult and bold task of reorganising the army. The states voted 1,200,000 livres to the king for the pay of the soldiers, and Charles made this a permanent tax by continuing to levy it without any renewed grant by the states. On November 2, the king published an ordinance decreeing that, by the advice of the three estates, he kept in his own hands the right of appointing all the captains of France and of fixing the number of their soldiers. The captains were drawn from those who had already served, but it was forbidden under pain of death and forfeiture that the title of captain or of commander of soldiery should be given to any one unless he had been appointed in this way. The captain selected his soldiers up to a number fixed by the king; he was responsible for their conduct; he was obliged to prevent them, under penalty of being himself punished by loss of nobility, death, or forfeiture, from robbing or maltreating the clergy, merchants, and labourers. The soldiers were placed under the jurisdiction of the bailiffs and provosts, and the peasants and burghers were authorised to repel force by force. Each captain was posted in a definite frontier fortress, and was forbidden to leave his station without orders. Barons having soldiers under their orders in their castles maintained them at their own expense and were held responsible for any excesses committed by them. They were forbidden from levying the *taille* or other taxes, except those to which they were entitled from ancient days, under pain of losing their castles.

This ordinance of 1439 was a revolution, since it placed the

armed forces of the realm under the control of the king. This led to intrigues. The lords and the professional soldiers declared that it involved the destruction of all order, and that it was essential to replace such a ruler as soon as possible by his son, the Dauphin Louis, who was then seventeen and who they declared showed precocious ability. They hardly suspected the use to which that ability would later be put.

The Praguerie (1440): Severity towards the Nobles.—The dauphin, already impatient to reign, lent himself willingly to the projects of the nobles. The Dukes of Bourbon and Alençon, the Counts of Vendôme and Dunois, the chief professional soldiers, such as Anthony de Chabannes, the bastard of Bourbon, John Sanglier, John de la Roche, put themselves at the head of the rebellion. It was a rising of all the nobility against the monarchy. Charles VII. was at Poitiers when he was informed that the Duke of Alençon and John de la Roche had surprised the castle of St. Maixant, but that the burghers had taken refuge in the tower of one of the gates where they were still holding out. "Remember Richard II., who shut himself up in a town and was taken," said Richmont to Charles. The king forthwith mounted on horseback and appeared the same night with 400 lances at St. Maixant; he entered by the gate which the burghers held. Throughout Poitou the burghers declared for the king and place after place fell into his hands. These events gave pause to the rebels, and the wiser among them, such as Dunois, hastened to make separate terms. The king was surrounded by 4800 lances, 2000 archers, and the "flying engines" of John Bureau, though he had not recalled one of the garrisons which made steady progress against the English in Normandy. Deserters from the rebels also placed themselves at the disposal of the king. In the Bourbonnais, Auvergne, and Poitou the burghers sided with the crown against the nobles; the states of Auvergne, assembled at Clermont, declared that they belonged wholly to the king, who was the guardian of the poor against the vexations of the soldiery. And they granted him money. The Dukes of Bourbon and Alençon and the dauphin saw that it was necessary not only to submit but also to implore pardon. They came to Charles VII., knelt before him, and prayed for forgiveness. Charles contented himself by saying to his son, "Louis, you have done well to come; you have remained away too long; go to your hotel for to-day, and to-morrow I will talk with you." To the Duke of Bourbon he said, "Good cousin, we are displeased with the offences which you have five

times committed against our majesty; but for our honour and love for others, we would have shown you the displeasure that we feel. Therefore see that your offence is not repeated." Next day Bourbon and the dauphin begged the king to pardon their associates. Charles said that he would do nothing, but that he was ready to permit them to return to their late allies without hindrance. Then the dauphin cried, "Sir, I must return, for I have given my word," and the king answered, "Louis, the gates are open to you, and if they are not wide enough I will have a breach made in the wall for you to pass through wherever you wish. You are my son, and you can be bound to no one without my leave and consent. But go, if you please, for with God's good help we shall find some other of our blood who will better aid us in maintaining our honour and lordship than you have done." The dauphin did not go.

This speedy submission of the rebels and this alliance between the burghers and the crown was a warning for the whole aristocracy. The Duke of Burgundy, who had refused all help to the rebels, felt that he was warned with the rest. He sought to form alliances to guard against so menacing a power, negotiated the release and paid part of the ransom of Duke Charles of Orleans, who had been a prisoner in England since Agincourt, who was the best poet of the age, and who was only set free on payment of £36,000. Philip the Good received the duke with open arms, married him to his niece, and invested him with the Golden Fleece; he sent the collar of the same order to the Dukes of Brittany and Alençon and despatched a long list of complaints to Charles VII. The king, to show that he was ready for all events, advanced to the north and exhibited royal justice on that frontier. He captured and handed over to the provost the bastard of Bourbon, the boldest of the professional soldiers, who, despite his birth, was sewn in a sack and hurled into the river. The king forced the Count of St. Pol to submit the question of the Ligny succession to the parliament of Paris. Meanwhile, the war against the English was carried on with unabated vigour, Meaux and Pontoise in central France and Dieppe in the north being taken from them, while their southern allies, the Counts of Albret, Foix, and Armagnac, were subdued. The English, who had been so haughty at the conference of Arras, were forced to seek a truce from France and the hand of a French princess, Margaret of Anjou, for their young king, Henry VI. (1444). Charles VII. further embarrassed the English by the marriage of

the dauphin with Margaret of Scotland; this union brought a new enemy to the doors of England.

The Ecorcheurs in Switzerland: Battle of St.-Jacques (1444). —Charles had only granted this truce to the English in order that he might complete the work which he had begun in 1439 for the reform of the kingdom. It was necessary, as he said, to take the bad blood from among his soldiers, to send companies of professional soldiers to perish abroad, if not in Spain, as was the case under Charles V., then in Switzerland and Lorraine, where by their death they might perhaps restore the reputation of French arms.

Two demands for help reached Charles simultaneously; Frederic III. sought aid against the Swiss and René of Lorraine against the people of Metz; Charles granted both requests.

Switzerland had founded and consolidated its independence against Austria and the empire by three battles, Morgarten, Sempach, and Näfels, where the peasants' knives had bravely vanquished the great feudal armies. The French nobles were always ready to fight again, but those of Germany were more circumspect, and the Austrian princes were reduced to arming one Swiss canton against another by wretched intrigues, in order that they might then be able to intervene. Now Frederic III. hoped to induce the Armagnacs of Charles VII. to intervene on his behalf.

Charles VII. hastened to send him the army with which he was at a loss to know what to do. It consisted of 14,000 French, 8000 English, Scots, Brabancons, Spaniards, and Italians, commanded by the late leader of the *Praguerie*, the Dauphin Louis. These terrible bands reached the Jura without much confusion, and entered Switzerland, advancing by the little valley of the Birse. The Swiss, who were besieging Zurich, did not wish to let that prize escape them, and sent only 2000 men to meet the enemy. But these were brave and were not content to make a simple reconnaissance. They did not know the strength of their opponents, a messenger who had been sent from Basle to inform them of the numbers of the French was killed by them, and in the brutal pride with which their past victories inspired them they hurled themselves blindly on the first body that they met (1444). Their bravery did not save them, and after making a desperate resistance behind the battered walls of an ancient cemetery, they were driven back and almost annihilated. The dauphin formed such a high opinion of these good fighters that he would not advance farther, but concluded

a treaty of alliance with the Swiss. The soldiers found little profit in so poor a land and turned away into Alsace and Suabia.

Charles VII. in Lorraine.—The king himself commanded the second expedition; many of the nobles followed him; there was talk of vindicating the ancient rights of the crown of France to the lands on the banks of the Rhine. It was too soon for such an attempt; before these districts could be conquered the conquest and unity of France herself had to be achieved. The expedition had no result, the people of Metz making a brave resistance. But the king received the homage of Epinal and showed the banner of France in the valley of the Moselle, where his successors later planted it.

Creation of a Standing Army: Companies of the Ordinance and Free Archers (1445 and 1448).—These two expeditions freed the king of the most mutinous of the adventurers and accustomed the rest to the beginnings of discipline, so that the execution of the ordinance of Orleans became possible. In 1445 the army was reduced to fifteen companies of a hundred lances, each lance implying six paid soldiers, the man-at-arms, his page, three archers, and one swordsman, all mounted. These were placed in garrison in the towns, the larger having twenty or thirty lances, so that the burghers remained more powerful than the soldiery and were able to repress disorders if they arose. The honour of entering these bodies was so great that many old mercenaries agreed to enrol in the companies to secure the first vacancy. All others were forced to return home at once, without disturbance of the public peace, under pain of being handed over to justice as outlaws. Such was the progress of order already that they obeyed and at the end of fifteen days none were left. Those who were enrolled were subjected to strict discipline. Charles VII. thus secured a picked force of 9000 cavalry.

By another ordinance (April 28, 1448) the king gave France a regular and permanent infantry, a force which she had in the past been compelled to hire from the Genoese. Each of the 16,000 parishes of the kingdom were obliged to supply the king with "a good companion," in the words of the ordinance, "who could make war." This body of men was equipped at the expense of the parishes with brigandines (light armour of jointed steel), a helmet, light casque, bow, sword, and dagger or crossbow. They had to exercise every feast-day and to serve the king whenever summoned, receiving four francs a month while on a campaign, with exemption from all *tailles* and subsidies, except the *aides* and the *gabelle*.

The free archer was not a model soldier, since military genius was not born at once in a nation long disarmed. But if Villon gives us the free archer of Bagnolet who falls on his knees before such trees as he mistakes for men-at-arms, begging their pardon and feeling sick at heart, satirical poetry is not always true to history. A century later, in 1544, the free archer, incorporated in the local regiments of Francis I., gained a victory, which the men-at-arms had lost, over the best troops in the world, the old Castillian levies, and after another century, in 1643, the free archer, having exchanged his arquebus for a musket, became the infantryman of Rocroi.

Financial Reform (1443).—All these reforms were subordinate to another, the reform of the finances. Jacques Cœur effected this in 1443. To establish mutual control of the officers of finance over each other, to force the individual receivers to render an account to the receiver-general, and to compel him to do likewise to the chamber of accounts; to force the great officials of the king, the paymaster, squire, treasurer of wars, and the master of artillery, to account every month to the king in person — such measures would to-day appear elementary; they were then admirable reforms. Thanks to these financial measures Charles VII. was able to create in France that which the most powerful of his predecessors had not achieved: a military force depending on the king alone, so that the sovereign was no longer at the mercy of baronial humour as he had so often been. Since the time of Charles V., ordinary indirect taxes, such as the dues on salt, merchandise, and beverages, had in actual fact been permanent. From the time of Charles VII. the land tax or the *taille* for the payment of the men-at-arms became permanent, being continued without a vote of the states. But at the same time the king gave guarantees for the good administration of financial justice by declaring the supremacy of the court of *aides*, which alone had the power to interpret ordinances respecting taxes and the power of final judgment in all civil and criminal cases which originated from finance.

Creation of the Parliaments of Toulouse (1443) and Grenoble (1453).—In 1442 the king made an expedition into Gascony and Languedoc, took some places, and on his return left behind him an institution which was more valuable to him than an army, a parliament which he had established at Toulouse, the jurisdiction of which extended over all Languedoc and the duchy of Guienne (1443). This was the first dismemberment of the

parliament of Paris, but southern claimants gained by not having to seek justice at such a distance; the new parliament became an eye of the monarchy, ever watching over these distant and dissatisfied provinces. The dauphin created the parliament of Grenoble in his lands (1453). An ordinance of 1446 prescribed that in event of a vacancy in the parliament, all the chambers together should nominate two or three candidates, from whom the king would select.

Ordinance for the drawing up of Customs.—It was impossible to attempt in the fifteenth century to create a uniform law for the whole of France; but it was possible to emerge from the chaos of customs and arbitrary power and to produce, especially in northern France, a justice which would supersede unwritten law. Charles VII. thought, to his credit, that all the customs of the kingdom should be written down according to the opinion of the most experienced persons in each district, examined and authorised by the great council and the parliament, so that the authorised text might be no longer modified. This great work was begun.

Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (1438): End of the Schism (1449).—In 1432 Charles accused Martin V. and Eugenius IV. of favouring the English and of giving benefices to these foreigners; Charles had ordained that no one should receive ecclesiastical preferment if he was not of the realm and loyal to the king. Six years later he went further. Assembling the clergy of France at Bourges, he presented the decrees of the Council of Basle for their acceptance. An ordinance or pragmatic sanction was drawn up according to these decrees, recognising the authority of the general council as superior to the pope; giving the clergy and abbots the right to select their chiefs; forbidding "annates, reservations, and expectancies," and permitting only with the royal approval the publication of papal bulls in France. The Great Schism of the West ended during this reign, when the fathers of Basle declared their obedience to Nicholas V. It had lasted 70 years, had weakened the Church, troubled men's consciences, and prepared the way for the Reformation.

Renewed Hostilities with the English (1449).—All these reforms having been accomplished, Charles found himself strong enough to make an end of hostilities with the English.

A certain Francis of Surienne, an adventurer of Aragon in the service of England, having attempted to take command of a garrison in one of the Norman towns held by the English, was

repulsed, because the soldiers, to whom the government of Henry VI. sent neither pay nor food nor munitions, would not share their already slender resources with a stranger. Francis, finding every gate closed against him, provided for the needs of his men in the manner of the captains of the period, falling, in the midst of peace, upon Fougères, a rich Breton town, and sacking it to pay his soldiers their wages.

Conquest of Normandy (1449).—The King of France and the Duke of Brittany at once demanded reparation from the English governor of Normandy, especially 1,600,000 crowns as damages. It was impossible to grant this demand, and when the indemnity did not arrive the French undertook to collect it for themselves, capturing Pont de l'Arche, Gerberoi, and Verneuil. Dunois entered the province with a strong army, which was joined by the Burgundians and Bretons of their own accord. The towns of Pont Audemer, Lisieux, Mantes, Verhon, Evreux, Louviers, St. Lo, Coutances, and Valognes were taken or surrendered without a blow by the burghers.

England was at this time drifting into the Wars of the Roses, which filled her with blood and ruin for thirty years. Parliament did not dare to attack the king personally, and therefore attacked his minister, the Duke of Suffolk. It was little concerned with the fate of Normandy, since defeats there would be new and victorious arguments to use against the duke. Somerset, the governor of the province, instead of concentrating his forces, spread them in twenty garrisons. He next tried to open negotiations, but, being as incapable in diplomacy as in war, he forgot to give powers to his envoys. That order and ability which had given the English their success were now on the side of the French, and victory came to them also. On October 18, 1449, they appeared before the walls of Rouen.

All the burghers of Rouen took arms against the English, who sought safety in the castle. Somerset was there with the aged Talbot and many lords, officers, and soldiers. But it was still realised that it was impossible to resist both the population and the French army. A truce was concluded on condition that Rouen, Caudebec, Villequier, Lillebonne, Tancarville, and Honfleur, in short all the lower Seine valley, should be ceded to France, and that as a hostage for the fulfilment of these conditions Talbot himself, the English Achilles, should be handed over.

Battle of Formigny (1450).—The governor of Honfleur refused to recognise this capitulation. The town was taken in midwinter

(December, 1449), and Harfleur suffered the same fate. England, driven to extremities, sent Thomas Kyriel, a knight of great renown, with 6000 men. It was her last effort. Kyriel landed at Cherbourg and tried to join Somerset at Bayeux, marching along the coast. The French followed him and (April 15, 1450) made a vigorous attack on him near Formigny, the Constable Richmont assailing one flank and the Count of Clermont the other. Kyriel's troops fought bravely but were defeated, leaving 4000 dead. This enabled the French to forget the 30,000 who had fallen at Crecy and the 12,000 prisoners of Poitiers and Agincourt. Vire, Bayeux, Avranches, Caen, Domfront, and Falaise fell into the hands of Charles VII.

The numerous garrison of Cherbourg thought they had no cause for fear, owing to the strength of the place and its situation on the sea. But the town was taken owing to this very fact. At high tide the French left their cannon anchored on the mole, and at low tide returned to serve them. It was the English at Crecy who had first used these weapons, but the French now knew best how to use them to advantage. Cherbourg surrendered, all Normandy had been conquered in a year. At the same time an unknown discipline appeared in the French army, which had become obedient and lived not on the land but on its pay.

Conquest of Guienne and Bordeaux (1451).—A month later, Dunois, Xaintrailles, Chabannes, and the two brothers, John and Gaspard Bureau, who controlled the French artillery so efficiently, marched against Guienne. Bourg, Blaye, Castillon, Libourne, and St. Emilion were easily taken. The burghers of Bordeaux, so attached to England as the market of their wines, attempted a *sortie*, fled as soon as they saw the enemy, and like the rest entered into negotiations. The French granted almost all their demands (June 5, 1451). The capitulation was not to be carried out for some days, and on the day when it was to be completed the herald in a loud voice demanded help from England for the men of Bordeaux; as no one answered, the gates were opened to the French.

English Expedition to Guienne (1452).—Despite the mildness of the victors, the people of Bordeaux soon regretted that distant English rule which had weighed so lightly on them. They were forced to pay taxes and to furnish soldiers, while their port was deserted and their wines unsold. If an English army, however small, should appear, Bordeaux would throw herself into the arms of England. This army did arrive.

The government of Henry VI., or, more accurately, the government of Margaret of Anjou, needed a great success in order to restore its position at home. Talbot, at the age of eighty, was sent to recover Guienne. His first steps were easy; Bordeaux voluntarily admitted the English (September 22, 1452), and almost the whole country followed suit. The King of France was forced to undertake the reconquest of the province.

Battle of Castillon (1453): End of the Hundred Years' War.—In the spring of 1453 the French army entered Guienne and laid siege to Castillon. The brothers Bureau formed a park of artillery, surrounded the walls, placed their cannon in batteries, and began to beat down the fortifications. Talbot hastened to the rescue. Before attacking he wished to hear mass, and the chaplain had begun the office when it was announced that the enemy were in retreat. "I will hear mass," cried Talbot, "when I have laid low the French," and he ordered the advance. One of his men told him that, so far from retiring, the French were well fortified, and that it was dangerous to attack them. Talbot in anger struck the face of the messenger and continued to advance like a true mediaeval paladin, wearing a cloak of red silk which made him conspicuous from afar. But the days for such feats of arms had passed, and the French cannon struck down the most distinguished knights no less than the simple soldiers. The first volley destroyed complete ranks. Talbot still advanced, but the second volley brought him down. The French then made a sortie, and falling on the English killed 4000 of them.

Next day Castillon surrendered and was followed by St. Emilion, Libourne, Cadillac, and Blanquefort. The French army appeared before Bordeaux; the free archers pillaged the moors, while ships brought from La Rochelle and Brittany blockaded the Gironde. Bordeaux was threatened with famine and sent envoys to Charles VII. In their presence John Bureau said to the king, "Sire, I have visited all the lines to select good places for the cannon; if it is your pleasure, I promise you on my life that in a few days I will demolish the city." The envoys realised that this time they must accept such terms as the king offered them. He took from Bordeaux its privileges, exacted a contribution of 100,000 crowns, and ordered the banishment, with confiscation of their goods, of twenty guilty persons. He further ordered the construction of two citadels to secure the future loyalty of the town. The Sieur de l'Esparré, who had called in the English and who had promised to rouse all the nobles of the district, was executed. On October 19, 1453, Charles VII. entered Bordeaux

in triumph. The Hundred Years' War was ended; in the whole of France the English only held Calais and two small places near it.

Fall of Constantinople (1453): The Vow of the Pheasant.—A great event occurred at this time at the other extremity of Europe. Constantinople, the old empire of the counts of Flanders, the last remains of the Roman Empire, the last barrier against invasion, had fallen, and Mohammed II. launched his light cavalry upon Hungary as far as Friuli. He swore that he would feed his horse on the altar of St. Peter's at Rome. The trembling Italians and the terrified Germans demanded a crusade; all eyes, all hopes, turned to France, who three centuries and a half before had risen as one man to avenge the sufferings of some of her pilgrims. But times had changed. France had hardly risen from the abyss, she was still bruised and bloodless, her desire was only to heal her wounds. One prince, however, answered the urgent appeal of the pope, the great duke of the West as the Duke of Burgundy was called, who had so carefully kept the war from his own lands and at whose court all that remained of chivalry in Europe had gathered. There men talked of tourneys and feats of arms, thought of reviving the days of Amadis and Roland, and in order that all doubt might be removed, Philip founded the Order of the Golden Fleece in the midst of magnificent fêtes. The crusade offered the new knights a good occasion for valiant deeds, a feudal war, chivalrous indeed as being against the Turks.

In the true Middle Ages they would have put on sackcloth and ashes, they would have fasted and prayed, and then have set off full of enthusiasm for Constantinople or Nicaea, Antioch or Jerusalem. At the court of Burgundy in the year 1454 they behaved otherwise; instead of a public fast they had a colossal banquet which would have swallowed up a full year's revenue of the King of France. "At the appointed hour the knights repaired to a hall in which the Duke of Burgundy had ordered a magnificent banquet, and there came many lords accompanied by princes and knights, dames and maidens, who proceeded to survey the side dishes and were greatly edified thereby. In that hall were three covered tables, one middle-sized, one large, and one small. The first contained a church, crossed, glazed, and elegantly fashioned with a real bell and four chanters. Another side dish was in the form of an anchored ship furnished with all kinds of merchandise and manned by tiny sailors; and it seemed that in the largest vessel in the world there could not have been

more work or a greater amount of rigging and sails than in this one."

"The second table, the longest, had in the first place a pie which contained twenty-six live people who played various instruments, each one in turn. The second dish on this table was a castle modelled on the lines of Lusignan; Melusine in the form of a serpent was at the very summit of the highest tower of this castle; from two of the smaller towers orange water gushed out at will, falling into the moat. The third dish was a windmill; the fourth a cask set in the midst of a vineyard; the fifth was a desert over which prowled a tiger marvellously fashioned, which tiger was doing battle with a large serpent. The sixth was a savage mounted on a camel; the seventh the model of a man who with a stick was beating a bush full of small game; the eighth was a fool mounted on a bear; the ninth a lake surrounded by several towns and castles, and upon the lake a sailing vessel floating about on its waters, and this vessel was exquisitely fashioned and well furnished with all the accessories of a ship."

"But to describe the service and the dishes, that would indeed be marvellous to tell, also I had so many other things to look at that I could hardly describe them accurately; but this much I remember, that each dish was furnished with forty-eight kinds of meats and that there were roasts in the form of waggons decorated with gold and azure."

"By the door through which all the side dishes were brought in and taken out entered a giant who, without the aid of art, was taller by a good foot than any man I had ever seen. He was attired in a long robe of green silk, striped in several places, and his head was adorned with a turban in the manner of the Moors of Granada; in his left hand he held a long and heavy sword of the old style and his right led an elephant draped with silk, on whose back was erected a castle which contained a lady dressed in the fashion of a nun in white satin, over which she wore a cloak of black cloth, and on her head a white kerchief after the manner of a Burgundian or a recluse. As soon as she entered the hall and saw the noble company who were gathered there, as if impelled to do so, she cried to the giant who led her,

"'Giant, I wish you to stay
For I see a noble company
To whom I must speak.
Giant, I wish you to stay.
Tell their wishes and bring to light
Things which must be known.'

"This woman was the Holy Church coming to implore the help of the knights of Burgundy. She delivered to those present a long and unpoetical plaint. Twelve virtues, represented by twelve ladies did likewise. Then the king at arms, Golden Fleece, entered holding a pheasant richly adorned with a collar of gold, pearls, and precious stones, and Duke Philip the Good made a vow, first to God and the Virgin and then to the ladies and the pheasant, to go and fight against the Turk. All those present followed his example and outbid each other; one vowed he would not do less than take the Grand Turk alive or dead, another that he would never again wear armour on his right arm; this one swore never to sit down to table on Tuesdays, that one never to return home until he had thrown a Turk with his legs in the air." (Olivier de la Marche, tome ii. p. 167.)

They should have guarded against the danger of mistaking all these extravagances for enthusiasm. At the height of their knightly ardour, and even before the sumptuous banquet which the Duke of Burgundy had just given them, the crusaders of the fifteenth century preserved their *sangfroid*. Each one carefully stipulated every ground which might excuse him from fulfilling his vow, and even if he had no excuse, his vow was not to be performed until the duke had fulfilled his. But the Duke of Burgundy had sworn that he would march to the defence of the Christian faith, only "provided that it was with the pleasure and consent of my lord the king, and that the land which God has committed to my care be in peace and security." In virtue of this prudent restriction the Duke of Burgundy did not go, no one went, no one had ever seriously intended to go.

Renewed Feudal Intrigues.—The feudal aristocracy was far more concerned with the progress of the French monarchy than with that of the Turk, since the French crown made laws instead of feasts and tourneys, organised finance, reformed the army, and expelled the English. The Duke of Burgundy had become distrustful of the crown almost from the moment of the Treaty of Arras; he had attempted to ally himself with the Duke of Orleans whom he had hastily delivered from the hands of the English, and to whom, as well as to the heads of the great families of the realm, he sent the collar of the Golden Fleece. Without a breach with the French king he gave support to all the malcontents, one of whom, the Duke of Alençon, had already offered to open his gates to the English if they cared to undertake a new invasion. The king caused him to be arrested by Dunois (1456); he was tried and condemned to death, prince of the blood though

he was, and only escaped the extreme penalty at the cost of perpetual imprisonment. Another baron, John of Armagnac, openly guilty of incest and bigamy, also intrigued with the English; a royal army seized his lands and the parliament exiled him (1455).

Flight of the Dauphin and the Duke of Burgundy (1456).—The king's most dangerous enemy was the heir to the throne, the Dauphin Louis, who at the age of seventeen had been the head of a great aristocratic plot against his father. To occupy his mind Charles had sent him to Dauphiné, his domain, where he was able to plot day and night, devising, says the chronicler, "many strange things." He plotted so much that he roused the land; many of his changes were certainly beneficial, but he changed for the sake of change, lavishing titles of nobility so that the expression "nobles of the Dauphin Louis" became proverbial. Despite his father, he married Charlotte of Savoy; he intrigued with every one, the king's ministers and his enemies, the Dukes of Alençon and Burgundy; he attempted to win over Jacques Cœur, favoured all who were hateful to Charles VII., and was as threatening and disquieting in Dauphiné as he had been in France.

The government of Charles VII. showed in these circumstances all the vigour which it knew so well how to display. Anthony de Chabannes, the former chief of the mercenaries, advanced with a body of troops to the frontier of Dauphiné, while the king himself went with an army to Lyons. The dauphin, disconcerted by this activity, wrote respectfully to Charles VII. that being, by his father and lord's permission, standard-bearer to the holy see, he was unable to refuse the request of the pope that he should join his good uncle of Burgundy, who was about to march against the Turks in defence of the Catholic faith. Having done this, he mounted with six of his men and rode at full speed to Franche-Comté, where he demanded the protection of the Duke of Burgundy. At the news of the good reception which Louis received from Philip the Good, Charles VII. remarked, "He has received the fox who will eat his chicken."

The fox showed at least that he could be humble and modest. He proclaimed himself a victim, recounted all the sorrows that he had endured so lamentably that the duke and duchess and the whole court wept, except perhaps the Count of Charolais. His hosts heaped honours and money on him; they were entirely at his disposal, refusing him nothing except an army to lead against his father. It was not good-will that was lacking,

but the duke, already very old, wished to end his life in peace. A war against France would have disturbed everything; it would have been needful to increase the taxes, which would possibly have caused rebellions in those terrible Flemish communes so ready to rise; Philip would have had to abdicate in effect by handing over the leadership of his army to his son, who was on almost as bad terms with his father as Louis was with Charles VII. Nor was it clear that in a prolonged struggle the Burgundian possessions, so strangely composed of French and Flemish territories, of communal and feudal lands, would hold together. The duke feared war on all grounds.

Death of Charles VII. (1461).—There was unrest at the court of France. Louis, in his refuge at Genappe, intrigued in the whole realm, wrote the most submissive letters to his father, but really aimed at estranging him from his ministers and at securing control of the latter. Charles VII. thought for a moment of giving the crown to his second son, and even secretly consulted Pope Pius II. on this point, for it was already said that those who offended Louis would not live long, witness Agnes Sorel and the dauphin's wife, the accomplished and clever Margaret of Scotland. This charge was untrue, but Charles believed his son to be capable of anything, and feared poison for himself. He was weakened by his irregular life, which had not ceased when he reached later years. An abscess formed in his mouth, an incurable ill which caused him great pain. In his weakened condition, filled with the fears that had formed in his mind, he refused all nourishment, possibly the nature of his illness prevented him from taking any, and so he died (July 22, 1461).

Jacques Cœur.—Two acts of ingratitude and wrong burden the reputation of Charles VII.; the cowardly abandonment of Joan of Arc to the English and the condemnation of Jacques Cœur. This great citizen was at first a merchant who from his journeys in Italy and the Levant had learned the secret of the wealth of the Italian cities. He imitated them by seeking the wealth of the East in Syria and Egypt, and his numerous ships traversed the Mediterranean. Summoned by Charles VII., who had known him at Bourges, to the position of royal treasurer or administrator of the demesne revenues, he was concerned for twelve years in the most important affairs of state, and showed in the royal council his clear mind and severe probity as in the management of his private affairs. The war became more and more costly; he was able at all times to supply the needed resources, dipping in his own coffers when the

king's were empty. He lent Charles VII. the funds for the recovery of Normandy, 20,000 gold crowns, telling the king, "All mine is yours." The courtiers took him at his word, and at the end of a hateful trial which they instituted against him, his spoils were divided and he was shut up in the convent of Beaucaire. But his old servants united to deliver him by force, and took him to Rome where the pope received him with great honour (1455). He died in the following year at Chois, of wounds received in fighting against the Turks. His house at Bourges still exists, one of the most curious examples of the architecture of the fifteenth century. Jacques Cœur not only opened a new route for French commerce, but also established relations between France and the Mohammedan princes, the Sultan of Egypt sending an envoy to Charles VII. in 1447. The effect of this policy was seen in the time of Francis I.

Another financier, John de Xaincoings, receiver-general of the kingdom, was condemned in 1454 to imprisonment and forfeiture for having taken great and excessive sums of the king's revenues. The splendid house that he had built at Tours was given by Charles VII. to Dunois.

It is not clear that Xaincoings was any more guilty than Jacques Cœur. The feudal aristocracy only esteemed profits made by the sword and loved to revenge themselves for the greater ability of men of business and their rapid rise to fortune, not always too scrupulously acquired. In the next age Semblancy suffered the fate of Enguerrand de Marigny; in the seventeenth century, Fouquet suffered that of Xaincoings; and the financiers, merchants, and traders had long to submit to the contempt of the nobles before they took their place.

Alan Chartier.—The Battle of Agincourt cost France an excellent poet, Charles of Orleans, who wiled away his long exile in England by cultivating poetry. Curiously enough, in the melodious verse of the prince, there is no memory of France, not a word about his misfortunes. The misery of the people which had filled the heart of Joan of Arc penetrated also the patriotic soul of a young Norman poet, Alan Chartier. "Men," he made France cry to her children in his *Quadriloge*, "men who are equipped with the faculty of right thinking, women of courage and good sense, far from virtue, you have forgotten the constancy of your ancestors, in order that you may live pleasantly you are ready to die in shame. What trifling, puny spirit keeps your hands idle and makes your will feeble?" There is true eloquence in this lofty and proud language, and if

he had always written as well, Alan Chartier would have deserved the surname of the *Father of French Eloquence* and a respect more sincere and real than he received. "One day," says Stephen Pasquier, "Margaret of Scotland, the wife of the dauphin, who was afterwards Louis XI., passing with a great following of ladies and lords through a hall where Chartier was sleeping, went and kissed him on the lips, at which many marvelled, for, truth to tell, nature had endowed him with a great spirit in an ugly body. Margaret told them that they need not be surprised at this mystery, since she had not kissed the man but the lips from which such precious words issued."

End of the Middle Ages.—The reign of Charles VII. marks the end of the Middle Ages in France and the beginning of modern times. In the ages which had passed, nothing of importance, save the Investiture Controversy and the Great Charter in England, had originated outside France or taken place without her. Germany had been involved in the struggle between the papacy and the empire, but that struggle ended with Boniface VIII. and Philip the Fair. France had been the foremost feudal state, had begun the crusades and chivalry, scholasticism and pointed architecture, and had founded the bourgeoisie. Under Charles VIII. she restored the Roman system of a standing army and permanent taxation; under Louis XI. she completed the destruction of the feudal aristocracy. The other states of Europe followed her example, but as she had led the way, so she profited most from the changes, and as she had been the leading power of the continent during the feudal period, so she was also the leading power in the monarchical period.

It is worth while to note, at the moment when the age of fiefs and communes and provinces gives way to the age of the state, when the idea of privilege is replaced by the idea of equality, at first an equality of obedience and later an equality of freedom, that these Middle Ages, so full of misery and grief, often showed a spirit of sturdy independence unknown in the succeeding epoch. In modern times there is more order, more material prosperity; it may be doubted whether in three hundred years they have shown more true dignity than was shown in some of the castles and cities of France.

CHAPTER XXXIV

LOUIS XI. TO THE DEATH OF HIS BROTHER (1461–1472)

Return and Coronation of the King.—Feudalism believed itself saved by the accession of the dauphin, Louis XI., the former ally of the nobles, and at that very time the guest, friend, and intimate of the Duke of Burgundy. The new king could only do in all things the exact contrary of his father. All the nobles in Burgundy and the Low Countries were mounted to form his escort. Philip the Good declared that he was willing to accompany the king to his coronation at Reims with 100,000 men. Louis found the number too large. "Why does my dear uncle of Burgundy wish to gather so many men," he asked; "am I not king? What have I to fear?" They went none the less, all covered with velvet and gold and jewels, their rich banners floating in the breeze, and 149 waggons bearing after them vessels of gold and silver and wines. In the midst of the gorgeous crowd was the duke in person, surrounded by an army of pages and servants, and wearing the mien of an emperor.

The appearance of the king was very different. He was so poorly clad and so humble in his speech that the true king appeared to be the Duke of Burgundy. But the duke was the king's protector and had at least guarded him from persecution. Louis could therefore refuse him nothing; he gave him, as a mark of honour, the right of nominating twenty-four councillors of the parliament, none of whom, it is true, ever sat in that body. He was granted free transit of merchandise from one frontier to the other, subject to the registration of this concession by the parliament, a registration which did not take place. The Duke of Alençon was pardoned for his sake, but Louis kept control over the children and fortresses of the pardoned duke. The Duke of Burgundy returned home, loaded with honours and at the same time ruined.

Then Louis XI. felt that he was at home, and forthwith set to work on the true labour of his reign, a reign which, whatever judgment may be passed on the king, must be regarded as one of the most important in the history of France.

Strength of the Feudal Party.—The reign opened in circumstances which, as far as foreign affairs were concerned, were most fortunate. Not one of the states bordering on France was

in a position to interfere with any of the projects of Louis XI. England was in the midst of the terrible Wars of the Roses and was unable for a long time to intervene effectually in the affairs of France. Spain was divided; Germany was rendered powerless by her anarchical constitution; Italy had long since ceased to be a danger to any one.

But if Louis XI. was sure of not meeting any serious embarrassment abroad, at home he was faced by many difficulties; feudalism was still powerful. At the head of the feudal party stood an aristocracy of appanaged princes, relations, more or less near, of the king; powerful families, rich from their vast demesnes, proud from their origin, and dangerous owing to their claims to independence. They formed, as it were, a collection of small states placed on the flanks of the kingdom. The house of Brittany had its old traditions of liberty and its friendly relations with England. The house of Bourbon held five or six great provinces in the heart of France, the Bourbonnais, Auvergne, Forez, Beaujolais, Dombes, Roannais, Montpensier, Vendôme, and other districts. The house of Anjou held Anjou, Maine, and Provence, but was, fortunately for the French crown, weakened by the dispersion of its lands and by its ambition which led it to aim at nothing less than the crowns of Spain, Sicily, Italy, and Jerusalem. The house of Orleans held Paris blockaded by its possessions of Dreux, Ham, Coucy, La Fère, Crespi, Verberie, and Orleans. The house of Alençon held Alençon and Perche, that of Artois held Eu. Finally there was the house of Burgundy, with all its possessions and dependencies, the county and duchy of Burgundy, counties of Rethel and Nevers, Artois, Flanders, Hainault, Brabant, Holland, Zeeland, Friesland, the counties of Macon and Auxerre, the castles of Roye, Peronne and Montdidier, and the Somme towns, St. Quentin, Amiens, Abbeville, and St. Valery, and lastly exemption from all homage, appeal, and sovereignty, the concession made by the Treaty of Arras.

Below these great houses were the families of Penthièvre, holding Limoges and Périgord; of Foix, Armagnac; and Albret, holding almost everything south of the Garonne to the Pyrenees; La Trémoille in Poitou; St. Pol in Picardy; Montmorency, Laval, La Tour, Clermont-Tonnerre; and Châlon, which ruled Neufchâtel in Switzerland, Orange, and other places.

Hasty Reforms: Popular Discontent: Dissatisfaction in the University and the Parliament.—Feudalism was rendered more dangerous by the fact that it realised the critical nature of its

position. "Our lord the king is dead; let each look to himself," said Dunois, when Charles VII. expired. They did not despair of reducing the monarchy to the position which it had occupied under the first Capetians. Louis XI., by his hasty reforms, gave the feudal party a host of allies. He dismissed the majority of his father's officials and restored those who had been displaced, the Alençons and Armagnacs. The people expected a reduction of taxation to mark the accession; the perpetual *taille* was raised from 1,800,000 to 3,000,000 livres, and a riot having occurred at Reims, Louis caused a good number of the burghers to be hanged or expelled; the figures of those who were hanged were sculptured on one of the cathedral towers. The king forbade the University of Paris to concern itself with the affairs of the king and city, closed its classes, and thus turned into the streets 25,000 students all ready for a riot. The parliament was no better treated; the king removed the chamber of accounts from its jurisdiction and reduced the extended jurisdiction of the parliaments of Paris and Toulouse by creating at their expense in 1462 the parliament of Bordeaux. He had already, in 1453, created the parliament of Grenoble; he later founded that of Dijon.

Discontent of the Clergy: Revocation of the Pragmatic Sanction.—The clergy were no better satisfied. The Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges appeared to Louis to give too much liberty to the clergy and too much power to the nobles; he revoked it, as Francis I. did at a later date, despite the request of parliament for its maintenance. He also demanded from the clergy a schedule of all their goods, in which were contained the smallest pieces of land, with their titles of ownership, proof of acquisition, rent-rolls due, in such a way that, as the ordinance says, the clergy could no longer trespass on the rights of king or his vassals.

Discontent of the Nobles.—The aristocracy was still more seriously threatened. It saw the king grant titles of nobility to the consuls of small towns and to the mayors of boroughs, and to prevent this rustic nobility from engaging in the sports of the aristocracy he forbade hunting to every one save the princes, under penalty of loss of limb and forfeiture. But the king who despised the first of feudal rights suddenly revived all the claims of feudal law to duties which had been obsolete for many years, He claimed *aides*, reliefs, wardship, forfeitures, drawing up a long list of old dues and demanding immediate payment. He might still have escaped if he had spared the greater families. But he

deprived the house of Breze of the seneschalship of Normandy and the house of Bourbon of the government of Guienne, giving the latter to a member of the house of Anjou that the two families might be embroiled with each other. He also removed his brother Charles from the government of Berry. Louis had various disputes with the house of Brittany as to appeals to the parliament of Paris to which the duke would not consent; on the question of feudal dues which the duke refused to pay; and as to the nomination of bishops which the duke would not leave to Louis. The king forbade him to coin money or to levy *taille* in his province.

Acquisition of Cerdagne and Rousillon (1462): Redemption of the Somme Towns (1463).—In 1463 Louis XI. fixed his residence on the northern frontier, going from one town to another, making frequent visits to the old Duke of Burgundy, sending the queen and the princesses to him, and employing every means to win him over. The king had a great project on foot, the redemption of the Somme towns, mortgaged by the Treaty of Arras. By lending 200,000 crowns to the King of Aragon, who was then greatly embarrassed, he received in pledge the districts of Cerdagne and Rousillon (1462). He felt sure that he would retain them, but he was still more anxious to regain the towns which his father had abandoned to secure the Burgundian alliance. The old duke, continuously pressed and always short of money as a result of his extravagance, promised to accept the ransom of these towns. When he made this promise he still hoped that it would not be possible for the king to find the 400,000 crowns required. Louis raised the sum in a few days; he would have emptied the purses of all his good towns rather than not pay the sum. On September 12 he sent the duke 200,000 crowns; on October 8 he sent the balance, and the important Somme barrier was once more in his possession.

League of the Public Good (1465).—The Count of Charolais, the violent son of the Duke of Burgundy, did not forgive this concession which had been won from his father's old age. He had also other grounds of complaint; the king had given him the lieutenancy of Normandy which he had already granted to the Duke of Brittany. The count was not a good son; Louis had proposed to Philip to bring him to reason.

Louis had not reigned four years before every one was opposed to him. The people, forced to contribute heavily to the necessities of the government, the nature of which they did not understand; the burghers, wounded in their private interests, which

they did not know how to sacrifice to the common good; the clergy, whose property was threatened; the lesser nobles, menaced with the loss of their rights and of their most cherished customs; the higher nobles, whose sovereign rights were impeached; all these classes, divorced from each other, so often hostile to each other, momentarily found themselves in accord in a wish to limit and reduce the royal authority.

Louis, who only realised this general hostility when it was too late to prevent its growth, attempted to calm the storm by a new measure, which, as was the case in all that he did, was directed to influence public opinion. He assembled the deputies of the cities of the north at Rouen, and before these simple burghers he undertook a formal justification of his conduct. He next assembled the princes, talked to them with his wonderful eloquence, laid his whole life bare before them, the exile which he had suffered, the miseries which he had endured, the difficulties which had faced him on his accession, and then set forth the good which he had done in a kingdom so embarrassed. He pointed to the existence of good order, the restoration of security, the territory gained in Rousillon, Cerdagne, and the Somme towns, and alluded to the wearisome journeys which he had made, journeys such as no King of France since Charlemagne had made in so short a time. The royal speech touched and moved the lords; they declared that never had any one spoken so well in French and swore that they would always be with the king, their bodies and goods at his service. The meeting was hardly over when the lords prepared means for an attack on Louis, raising against him his brother the Duke of Berry, a young man of eighteen, who was to be their leader.

The princes declared that this armed rising against royal power was the League of the Public Good and that they were actuated by sorrow for the misfortunes of the realm under the anarchical and pitiful rule of Louis XI. The king having written to the Duke of Bourbon, asking him to come to his help with a hundred lances, the duke answered by a long letter, saying that "the princes of the blood and of royal lineage had considered the state in which they were, both with regard to the justice, police, and government of the realm and to the excessive burdens laid on the poor, who had to bear insupportable charges, vexations, and interference; that the princes were agreed that they should assemble together to tell him with one voice that these things were so, that they might produce order and discipline such as had not been since the king's accession."

Louis counted also on the aged Duke of Burgundy, but (March 12, 1465) Philip the Good fell into that state of mental weakness which endured for the two years longer that he lived and Charles the Rash or Bold, Count of Charolais, on the same day assumed the government of the duchy.

On the following day (March 13, 1465) the Duke of Bourbon published his answer to the king and two days later the Duke of Berry issued a manifesto against his brother's administration. On March 22, Francis II., Duke of Brittany, declared that he was the foe of all foes of the Duke of Burgundy, not excepting the king. The hostile declarations of the nobles followed; every one had joined the League of the Public Good.

Louis XI. considered that it would be difficult for all these princes, lords, districts, and armies to organise concerted action, that he might overcome his difficulties by activity. His plan was well formed. He proposed to hold Charles the Bold in the north and Francis II. in the west, or at least to hinder their advance on Paris, and to profit by this to reduce the Duke of Bourbon and the rebels of the south, crushing them between his own army and the Italian troops which his ally, Francesco Sforza, was sending to him and the help which would be rendered him by his good friends, the lords of Armagnac and Nemours. He would then return and defeat in succession the Dukes of Brittany and Burgundy, who would not yet have been able to unite.

Battle of Montlhéry (1465).—The king entered the campaign with that disciplined army which his father had bequeathed to him. Avoiding Bourges, the capture of which would have taken time, he took St. Amand, Montluçon, Sancerre, Gannat, and Riom, offering battle to the princes, who did not dare to accept it, and imposing on them new oaths of fealty which they would break as soon as they saw the king's difficulties increase. And those difficulties did increase incessantly. Louis relied on the Count of Armagnac and the Duke of Nemours, whom he had loaded with gifts and honours; they both came, but it was to join the rebels.

The same treason was found in the west and north. The Count of Maine, ordered to oppose the Breton forces, retired before them along the Loire. The Duke of Nevers, instructed to defend the barrier of the Somme against the Burgundians, handed this gate of France over to them. On July 5 Charles the Bold, without having met a single obstacle, arrived before Paris, proclaiming everywhere that he would abolish the *taille* and the *gabelle*.

The question was whether Paris would side with the princes. This was a matter of life and death for Louis, who, leaving the Bourbonnais and the rebels of the south, was anxious only to re-enter the capital, believing himself lost if he failed to do so. His biographer states that in such a case he would have retired to Switzerland or to Francesco, the Duke of Milan, whom he regarded as his great friend. He wrote to the Parisians that their city was dearer to him than all else; that he would entrust the queen to them; that she wished her child to be born among them; that he was himself coming and would be with them without fail on July 16.

Paris appeared little moved by these royal flatteries. The most influential body, the University, made many processions and had many sermons preached, but vetoed the suggestion of the arming of the students, pleading its privileges. The burghers and the people showed a like coolness. Louis XI. had strong reasons for haste and his reasons were increased by the slow advance of the Dukes of Berry and Brittany; it was essential to arrive before them.

On the morning of July 16 the king was at Montlhéry, where the Burgundians barred his way. He passed through them, while Charolais did likewise with the royalist left wing, so that there were neither victors nor vanquished, but a crowd of fugitives. "On the side of the king," says Comines, "there was a statesman who fled as far as Lusignan in Poitou and on the count's side a man of property who fled as far as Quesnoi in Hainault." The king attained his object. Leaving the count to sound fanfares on the battlefield to prove conclusively that he was victorious, the king hastened to enter Paris, where he armed the burghers, accepted the help of six citizens, six members of the parliament, and six clerks of the University as a council, and attempted by these means to secure Paris, believing that if he held Paris he would hold France whatever might befall.

Among the rebels nothing was done in co-operation or in haste. The young Dukes of Berry and Brittany, "who," says Comines, "from fear of fatigue, wore satin cuirasses made to look like steel, with gilded nails worked on them, came very slowly, and when all were arrived, Bretons, Gascons, and Lorrainers, jealousies appeared and hatred. The Duke of Berry, heir to the throne, already excited distrust, especially in the mind of Charolais, who laughed at his weakness and at the pity which he showed for the dead and wounded. 'Have you heard this man talk?' said the impetuous count. 'He was sorry for the fate of

seven or eight hundred men whom he saw wounded, who were nothing to him, who were unknown to him ; he would be sorry enough if the matter touched him personally and is just the man to make terms quickly and leave his allies in the lurch. Therefore it is well that he should be provided with friends.' "

Treaties of Conflans and St. Maur (1465).—Though Louis XI. was personally very brave, he preferred battles of wit, the use of finesse and stratagem. He negotiated and discussed continuously, seeking to divide the barons who were already on such doubtful terms, considering neither money nor promises. The league was achieving nothing, some of its members being already anxious to sell themselves to the king. These negotiations took place between Charenton and St. Antoine ; each proved to have his price and much was done. The Count of Armagnac, the Duke of Nemours, the Count of St. Pol, John of Calabria came in ; one demanded money, another lands, another the constable's sword ; nothing was refused, and the king saw the league already dissolved by his skill, the Dukes of Brittany and Burgundy left isolated and possibly hostile to each other.

Unfortunately for the king, he could not be everywhere at once and wherever he was not he was betrayed. On September 21 Pontoise went over to the princes ; Rouen, Évreux, Caen, Beauvais, and Peronne did likewise, and the movement threatened to involve Paris. Louis saw that the negotiations must be accelerated. " The king came one morning to our host, having a force of cavalry on the bank but in his boat only four or five persons besides those who rowed him. The Counts of Charolais and St. Pol stood on the river bank on their side awaiting the king. Louis demanded of Charolais, ' Brother, will you give me a safe-conduct ? ' the count having married the king's sister. The count answered, ' Yes, sire, as a brother.' The king landed ; the counts did him great honour, as was right, and he, never sparing of words, began the conversation, saying, ' My brother, I know that you are a gentleman and of the house of France.' ' How so ? ' asked the count. ' When I sent my ambassadors to Lille a little while ago to my uncle, your father, and to you, that fool Morviller spoke so well to you that you demanded by the Archbishop of Narbonne that I should withdraw the words Morviller had said before the end of the year. You have been as good as your word and it is still far from the end of the year.' Louis said this smiling and laughing, knowing the character of those to whom he spoke and that they would like such speech ; and pleased they certainly were. Then

he added that he delighted to deal with such men who kept their word."

Peace was speedily concluded by the treaties of Conflans with Charolais (October 5) and that of St. Maur with the princes (October 29). "The Normans want a duke," said the king. "Well, they shall have one." The duke was his brother, to whom he gave Normandy increased by the county of Eu and the duchy of Alençon and with it the right of nomination to offices, ecclesiastical rights, and so forth. All the rest were equally gratified. The Duke of Burgundy received Boulogne, Guines, Roye, Montdidier, and the Somme towns. The Duke of Brittany received Étampes and exemption from appeals to the parliament, release from feudal dues, and the right of coining money; in a word, a small independent kingdom. The Duke of Lorraine received the march of Champagne free from homage, Mouzon, Ste. Menehould, and Neufchâtel, lands to the value of 30,000 crowns. The Dukes of Bourbon and Nemours, the Counts of Armagnac, Dunois, Dammartin, the Sieur d'Albret, and many others acquired domains, pensions, and promises for the future. Typical of those promises was that to the Count of Charolais that he, being now thirty, should one day marry the king's daughter who was two, and should receive in dower Champagne, Langres, Sens, Laon, and Vermandois. While waiting for this dower Charles demanded and secured Ponthieu. The princes, says Comines, sacked the monarchy and took pillage.

All this seemed to have little to do with the public good. It was necessary to lend an air of doing something for the standard which they had raised and Count Dunois was selected to preside over thirty-six notables charged to inquire into the faults and disorders of the government, with full power to remedy them by an ordinance which the king was to ratify within fifteen days.

Revolts in the Duchy of Burgundy: Recovery of Normandy by the King (1466).—Had this treaty been executed strictly, the kingdom of France would have been ruined, but it was certain that Louis XI. would not execute it if it were possible to do otherwise; already the parliament, under his influence, had declined to register it. Warned, however, by the hard experience through which he had passed, Louis resolved not to proceed so hastily in future and only to undertake one affair at a time. He had relied too much on force; the League of the Public Good showed him the full extent of the greed and treachery with

which he was surrounded. For the future he was more prudent, though his prudence used all means, ruses, perfidy, and cruelty.

The cession of Normandy was a special danger, since by this province the domains of the Dukes of Brittany and Burgundy joined, and all the coasts from Dunkirk to Nantes were laid open to the English. Louis from the first moment considered means for its recovery. The Duke of Brittany and the new Duke of Normandy who were near neighbours became also enemies; Louis promised to reconcile them like the judge in the fable. But it was essential to prevent Charolais from interfering, and this the king and the circumstances accomplished, three revolts occurring at Liége, Dinant, and Ghent simultaneously.

Liége, bounded by the Burgundian estates, was a free city under its bishop, who at this time was Louis of Bourbon, the duke's nephew, a young man with a taste only for pleasure and for the money which his pleasures demanded. Liége became discontented under such a government; the King of France supported the insurrection, promising help; and the people of Liége, though they hardly needed encouragement, expelled their bishop, attacked the Burgundian possessions in Limburg, and provoked a war which became serious. Dinant followed the example of Liége and hurled insults at the "old dotard of a duke" and his son, Charlotteau, which could only be wiped out in blood. Finally a rebellion broke out at Ghent in which the liberty and even the life of Charles the Bold was threatened.

There was thus enough to occupy the attention of Charles for some time and Louis had no fear of being disturbed in his projects. He at once sent the Duke of Brittany 120,000 gold crowns to induce him to leave his old ally to his fate, and then invaded Normandy. In a few weeks the whole province was in his power, the Duke of Burgundy having been able to do nothing but write mildly to the king. The king answered that he had been compelled to act as he had done, whether he would or no; that his brother and the Normans could not agree; that an ordinance of Charles V. formally forbade the cession of this particular province and he had thus no right to grant it as an appange; finally that he trusted that at his recommendation the duke would be ready to treat the poor people of Liége and Dinant gently (1466).

Charles the Bold could neither answer nor act, and the chiefs of the other princely houses would not move. The king had either won them over or neutralised them. The house of Bourbon had been gained by the gift to Duke John of a whole realm

in the centre of France—Berry, Orleans, Limousin, Périgord, Quercy, Rouergue, and Languedoc; while his brother, Peter de Beaujeu, received the king's daughter Anne in marriage, and the bastard of Bourbon became Admiral of France and Governor of Honfleur. The house of Anjou had been conciliated by the gift to John of Calabria, son of René, of 120,000 livres which he needed for his adventures; the house of Orleans by the securing of Dunois, the old hero of the English wars. Louis had finally won over the Count of St. Pol, the friend of his youth and the confidant of Charles the Bold, by making him constable of the kingdom, Captain of Rouen, and Governor of Normandy.

The king attached the burghers to him with as much care as he used towards the princes. To those of Paris, especially, he granted permanency of their offices and exemption from all taxes; he armed them to the number of 60,000 or 80,000 men and carefully fortified the city. He lived almost as a citizen of Paris himself, dining without ceremony with Denis Hesselin, calling him his friend and standing as godfather to one of his children; sending the Queen and the Duchess of Bourbon to dine with the first president, Dauvet; going nearly every day to mass at Notre-Dame and taking care to leave always some rich offering. The burghers, like the princes, began to side with this king who gave them everything.

New Coalition against the King (1467).—No one dared to dispute the possession of Normandy with the king. Charles the Bold, who became Duke of Burgundy by the death of his father, was isolated and alone; despite his great power he could do nothing. He therefore sought allies abroad. Though a Lancastrian by his mother, he had married the sister of Edward IV. of England, who sent him 500 Englishmen and offered him a fleet. He found another ally in Francis II. of Brittany, who after helping Louis to recover Normandy from his brother, had become alarmed at the king's rapid success and turning once more against him had seized Caen and Alençon, from which he threatened the rest of the province. He also called in the aid of the English and offered them their choice of twelve towns.

States-General of Tours (1468).—In face of this new peril, Louis appealed to the opinion of France. On April 6, 1468, he assembled the States-General of the kingdom at Tours and asked them bluntly whether they wished Normandy to be part of the demesne of the crown. If it were given to the king's brother, it was given to the Dukes of Burgundy and Brittany and to their

allies the English. The States answered that neither from fraternal affection, nor by reason of a promise, nor from threat of war, nor from regard to any earthly danger ought the king to agree to the separation of the duchy of Normandy or allow it to pass into the hand of any living man save himself.

They added that, according to law, Charles of Berry was entitled to an appange of 12,000 livres a year only, with the title of duke or count, and that since the king was ready to grant him 60,000 livres, he ought to be well content. As for the Duke of Brittany, he should be summoned to evacuate the towns he had seized, and if he did not do so, he should be expelled by force. Finally the States resolved to send an envoy to the Duke of Burgundy to inform him of their decision and to ask him to aid the king in the work of restoring good justice throughout the realm.

Treaty of Ancenis with the Duke of Brittany (1468).—Charles the Bold received the message with a contempt which Louis took care to make known throughout France, but before he could act the king by the rapidity of his blows had compelled the Duke of Brittany to treat at Ancenis (September 10).

The Interview of Peronne (1468).—The king, freed from the Bretons and having an excellent army under his command, might surely have accepted the struggle with the Duke of Burgundy. But an English fleet and army was assembled at Portsmouth ready to cross, and Louis was eager at all costs to keep the English in their own island. He had no liking for battles, where so much depended on chance, cowardice, and treason; he remembered the great defeats of the two preceding centuries, when the outcome of one day had ruined a reign; he felt that he was surrounded by traitors; he had recently executed Charles of Melun, grand master of France, who had abandoned him at Montlhéry. He further realised his mental superiority to his rival, and counted on securing by negotiation all the fruits of a victory. But for this, it was necessary that he should go in person. Some feared that he would be in danger if he placed himself in the hands of the duke. Louis feared nothing; the grand master of the Golden Fleece, the very foremost of the knights, could not be guilty of a public act of treachery. The king also took precautions. He obliged the duke to accept his money for the expenses of the war, or at least half the sum offered; he demanded a safe-conduct, which contained the terms that "You may come and stay and reside surely, and return surely at your pleasure and whensoever you will, without

any hindrance being placed in your path, for any reason that may exist or which may hereafter arise."

The king trusted in this and appeared almost alone at Peronne, where Charles the Bold received him with respect (October 9). But with the duke the king saw his most bitter opponents—Philip of Bresse, whom he had held prisoner for three years; the Sieur de Neufchâtel, whom he had deprived of Epinal; the Sieur de Chateauneuf, for whose use he had with his own hand designed one of those iron cages which had long been used in Italy and Spain. Louis began to remember the bridge of Montereau, and, to be free from any sudden attack, asked to be lodged in the castle, a place of sad memories, where Herbert of Vermandois had held Charles the Simple prisoner. Louis's fears were well founded. The duke himself was not without some temptation to take advantage of the mistake which the king had made. But the conditions of peace were calmly discussed until, on October 10, news came that Liége had risen, that the bishop and all his chapter had been murdered with the Burgundian envoy Humbercourt, and that the leaders of the rebels were two French agents.

The news was greatly exaggerated, since neither the bishop nor Humbercourt were dead, and it was most unlikely that the revolt was the work of the king, who had no interest in killing the Bishop of Liége, which would have embroiled him with the Bourbons, but had rather interest in winning him over, and for this purpose had tried to secure for him the cardinal's hat. It may be remarked that a revolt of this city, so harshly treated by Charles the Bold, was a most natural thing; that the movement began on September 8, and that the interview took place on October 9; that the relations of Louis with the populace of Liége dated from the beginning of his reign; and that even if the news had been true, the terms of the safe-conduct still covered Louis XI.

Yet from the point of view of Charles the Bold, an event like this seemed to confound his passion with his interest, to legitimatise, at least in his own eyes, the disloyal act which he meditated. He fell into a violent passion, uttered the most terrible threats, and caused the gates of the castle to be closed. Louis was a prisoner; a great lord once taken, says Comines, cannot be freed; it may be added, that he could not be guarded but must be slain. But if Louis were killed, his brother would succeed, and that brother was then the friend, ally, and guest of the Duke of Brittany. It was doubtful if it was worth while to run

such a risk to give the crown to a prince devoted to the Breton interest. It seemed better to wrest from the king important concessions, to humiliate him, and by this means to ruin him in public opinion. The calculation was as faulty as the execution of the plan was defective.

"On the night of the thirteenth, the duke did not go to bed. He only lay down two or three times on his couch and then walked about, as his manner was when he was troubled. Morning found him more angry than ever, threatening and ready to do some great deed. Then he resolved that the king should swear peace and march with him to Liége to aid him in taking vengeance, and to help the bishop, who was the king's near relative; then the duke would be content. So he suddenly went to the king's chamber and bore him these words. A friend had warned the king, assuring him that no ill would befall him if he granted these two points, but that if he did otherwise, he would be in great peril, so great that none greater could ever come to him."

"When the duke reached the king's presence, his voice trembled, for he was deeply moved and ready to burst forth. He made humble obeisance, but his gestures and voice were stern, as he demanded of the king whether he would hold the treaty of peace which had been written and agreed, and if he would swear to it. The king answered, 'Yes.' As a matter of fact, the treaty made little or no change as far as the Duke of Burgundy was concerned from the treaty made before Paris; as far as the Duke of Normandy was concerned it made a great change, since the duke exchanged Normandy for Champagne and Brie and other neighbouring places. Then the duke demanded whether the king would go with him to Liége to aid in avenging the treason of the citizens which was due to him and his coming; the duke dwelt on the relationship between the king and the Bishop of Liége, who was of the Bourbon family. The king answered that as soon as the peace was sworn, which he greatly desired, he would be ready to go to Liége and to aid the duke with men, many or few as the duke saw fit. The duke was greatly pleased with these words, and forthwith produced the treaty of peace and brought from the king's chest the true cross, which St. Charlemagne had borne and which was called the cross of victory; the bells of the town were rung, and all rejoiced."

To hand over Champagne to his brother was to give it to Charles the Bold, who found this territory desirable for him as a means of communication between his possessions in Flanders and those in Burgundy. To march against Liége, where his flag

was flown, was an act of cowardice, but the princes of that period put success first and honour afterwards. Louis XI. followed the duke to the siege of the town and fought bravely. One day, in a moment of alarm, he assumed the command for a time. He led the assault, and when the people of Liége, seeing him, cried, "Vive la France!" he answered loudly, "Vive Bourgogne!" The city was taken (October 30), and when this shameful object had been attained, Louis sought the duke and said to him with an air of good humour that "if he had any further need of him he should not spare him, but that if he had nothing more for him to do, he was anxious to go to Paris to announce their agreement to the parliament, for, according to the custom of France, all agreements are published there, or otherwise they are void. He further asked the duke if he might come to Burgundy in the following summer and spend a month making good cheer; that was settled when they parted, and the king took leave of the duke, who conducted him for half a league on his way, and when they separated, the king said, 'If my brother who is Brittany happens not to be content with the share that I have granted him for love of you, what shall I do?' The duke answered hastily and without thought, 'If he will not take it, and you content him in some other way, I am satisfied as to you two.' This question and answer was to have great importance later on."

Louis gives his Brother Guienne instead of Champagne (1469). —"On Saturday, November 19, 1468, there was published in the quarters of Paris to the sound of trumpets and in public, the accord and union made between the king and the Duke of Burgundy, and it was announced that on account of the past no one should dare or be so bold as to attack in any way the said duke, whether by word of mouth or writing, by signs or pictures, verses or poems, defamatory libels, songs or acting, or in any other possible way. Those who were found doing so should be heavily punished in proportion to the seriousness of the offence. On the same day, by order of the king and in virtue of his commission, all the pies, jays, and owls in the city of Paris were taken, whether they were in cages or otherwise, and were brought to the king; the places where they had been found were enrolled in writing and also all the good words which these birds could say and which had been taught to them."

The word which these bold birds cried most and which they had best learned was Peronne, the scene of the king's defeat in

one of these trials of wit which he so much loved and where, taken in a trap, he had left his enemies nothing to do but to close the gate and dictate humiliating conditions for his release. Louis cared only to obliterate the memory of this unfortunate treaty.

Charles the Bold had said that it was enough that the king's brother should be content, and Louis took care that his brother should be thoroughly content. In place of the barren and impoverished Champagne he gave him the fair and fertile Guienne; in place of Troyes for a residence he gave him Bordeaux; and Charles of Berry readily accepted such an exchange which at one stroke divided him from the Burgundians and embroiled him with the English, the former masters of the district who still hoped to regain it.

The Cages of Iron: Cardinal La Balue and the Bishop of Verdun (1469).—One of the king's councillors had betrayed him during these negotiations, La Balue, a man of low origin, who had been made Bishop of Angers and Cardinal, and who had strongly advocated the interview of Peronne. Louis discovered that he was in secret correspondence with Burgundy. He was arrested with his accomplice, the Bishop of Verdun, and they were both shut up in two iron cages, where they remained for ten years. Chabannes had served Louis better. He commanded the army which the king had assembled near Peronne, and after the treaty had been signed Louis instructed him to disband his troops. Chabannes took care not to do so and the nearness of this army had imposed some restraint on the duke. The king showed his appreciation of such a man. He sent him with his army against the Duke of Nemours and the Count of Armagnac. The first secured his pardon; the latter saved himself by flight, the king confiscating his goods. At the same time, the Duke of Brittany swore to renounce all foreign alliances by the Treaty of Angers and the king gave the Earl of Warwick, who had been reconciled with Margaret of Anjou, the means of overthrowing Edward IV., Charles the Bold's brother-in-law.

Assembly of Notables at Tours (1470).—The king, having once more isolated the Duke of Burgundy, dared to attack him openly. He assembled a meeting of notables at Tours in which there figured among the sixty members thirty-two magistrates and the presidents of the various courts of finance and justice in the kingdom. He explained to this meeting his complaints against the Duke of Burgundy, whom he accused of having attacked the ports of Normandy in time of peace; of having exacted from

his subjects, the vassals of the crown, an oath that they would serve the duke against all, not excepting the king ; and of having seized the goods of Frenchmen on the way to the fair of Antwerp. The notables answered that on these grounds the Treaty of Peronne had been broken by the duke, and that the king, as a result, might occupy the places on the frontier, St. Quenin, Roy, Montdidier, and Amiens. Louis mobilised an army of 100,000 men and the duke was powerless.

New Coalition against the King (1471).—But the Dukes of Brittany and Guienne and the Constable St. Pol, the chief of the army, were alarmed at the rapid progress of the king and had already betrayed him. In the previous year a dauphin had been born, and as Guienne was no longer heir to the throne, it was to his interest to revive the league of princes. Louis, seeing that his success was declining, realised that new plots were formed against him ; he thought it wise to halt and agreed to the Treaty of Amiens with Charles the Bold. This was the more necessary since at this very time Edward IV., the ally of Burgundy, regained the English throne (1471).

Death of the King's Brother (1473).—Louis XI. had thus once more to snap the thousand chains with which the aristocracy sought to shackle the crown. The court of his brother was no longer that of a young fool without money or soldiers, but that of the master of a rich and powerful domain, and it became the centre of all intrigues. A new and great feudal house had been established. The Duke of Burgundy offered the Duke of Guienne his only daughter, in the hope of one day adding to his possessions in Aquitaine states more extensive, more populous, and richer than those of the king himself. It is true that Charles at the same time offered his daughter to the son of the emperor on condition that he should be named King of the Romans. It is doubtful whether the duke himself knew which promise he intended to fulfil, but the king was alarmed at the mere prospect of such a union. His brother was the great obstacle that he found in his path, and he made one last attempt to attach the prince to the fortunes of his own house, offering him four more provinces, to extend his domain to the Loire, and to marry him to his own daughter. Charles of Guienne did not answer ; he made preparations for war, summoning all the forces of his duchy and nominating an enemy of the king, the Count of Armagnac, general of his forces.

The king saw the danger increasing and did not know how to avert it. He appealed to the Scots for help ; he asked the pope

to judge between him and his brother, he declared himself a canon of Notre-Dame de Cléry, he ordered prayers for peace, and instituted the custom of praying at midday, at which hour all the citizens of France were to fall on their knees and say three *Aves*. This institution was the origin of the Angelus. If a writer of the following age may be believed, Louis went himself to Notre-Dame and prayed, "Ah, my good lady, my little mistress, my great friend, in whom I always find all my comfort, I pray you supplicate God for me and be my advocate with Him, that He may pardon me the death of my brother whom I am causing the wicked Abbot of St. Jean to poison. I confess to you as to my good patroness and mistress; but what else could I do? He only troubles my realm. Seek my pardon, then, my good lady, and I know that it will be granted."

His brother actually died; his death was the only event which could free Louis XI. from the imminent peril in which he was placed. The contemporary accounts state that the Abbot of St. John d'Angely, almoner to the Duke of Guienne, had himself picked and peeled a peach which he presented to the lady of Montsoreau, who shared it with Charles of Guienne. Two months later the lady was dead; eight months later the duke was dead. The abbot was accused of the dual poisoning, was taken to Brittany, tried and imprisoned, but one morning, after a terrible storm, he was found dead in his prison; it was stated that the devil had strangled him. The documents of his trial were brought to Louis XI., suppressed by him, and the judges who showed so much complaisance were loaded with royal favours.

It is questionable whether the duke was poisoned, whether, if he were poisoned, Louis XI. was guilty. The problem is insoluble. But if the guilt of the king must remain dubious, the ferocious joy which he showed at the death of his brother cannot be doubted. It appears in the letter which he wrote to the Count of Dammartin while the Duke of Guienne was dying: "Grand master, since the last letters that I wrote you I have had news that the Duke of Guienne is dying and that there is no hope of recovery. This was made known to me by one of his intimates, who sent an express messenger; he added that it was believed my brother could not live more than a fortnight at most. That you may know this information is reliable, it came from the monk who said the hours to the Duke of Guienne. I have been greatly moved and signed myself with the sign of the cross from the head to the feet."

War with the Duke of Burgundy (1472).—This event destroyed

all the projects of the Duke of Burgundy. In his anger, he published a manifesto in which he accused the king of treason, *lèse-majesté*, and parricide. Louis, he said, had two years before tried to remove him by the dagger or poison; he had now caused his brother to perish pitiably by means of poison, maledictions, sorcery, and diabolical invocations. To avenge him, the Duke of Burgundy passed the Somme and entered the kingdom, swearing that he would put everything to fire and sword, though the truce made with Louis XI. had not yet expired. The war was of the character the duke had said. Appearing before the little town of Nesle, he entered it, declaring that the capitulation was broken, and ordering the slaughter of all the inhabitants. Men, women, and children had taken refuge in the great church, where they were massacred. The duke rode in, crossed himself, and said, "By St. George, my children, you have made a fair butchery." The streets ran six inches deep in blood.

Resistance of Beauvais : Joan Hachette.—Such a massacre was a warning to other towns to defend themselves strongly. Thus when the Burgundian army arrived before Beauvais (June 27, 1472), the burghers resisted a violent assault for eleven hours. The women took part in the defence, and one of them, called Joan, like the heroine of Domremy, snatched a Burgundian banner which had been planted on the rampart. The king, in recognition of this, instituted an annual procession in which the women passed before the men. Charles, who had hoped to take the place by a sudden attack, was not prepared for a siege. He attempted to hurry the matter and delivered a new assault which cost him 1500 men (July 9). A fortnight later, he raised the siege and turned towards Normandy, burning all the small places he could enter, such as Eu, St. Valery-en-Caux, Longueville, and Neufchâtel, while the French followed him closely, cutting off his supplies. Charles was checked before Dieppe, and fell back on Rouen, where, he said, he had arranged for the Duke of Brittany to join him. He halted under the walls for four days, and then, accusing Francis II. of having broken his promise, returned to his own lands.

New Treaty with the Duke of Brittany (1472).—If Francis II. had failed to keep his appointment it was because Louis XI. had attacked him vigorously, capturing La Guerche, Machecoul, Ancenis, and Chantocé. Then, having frightened the duke by his success, the king offered him a favourable peace. It was signed on October 18, and on October 22 Charles the Bold,

who had always been so intractable, himself accepted the Treaty of Senlis.

Comines enters the Service of Louis XI.—The Treaty of Peronne, which was believed to have overthrown the King of France, was torn up; the shame of Liége was compensated in the eyes of Louis XI. by the shame of Beauvais. It was felt that a king who had emerged with good fortune and skill from such a critical condition might do anything in the future with greater resources, and the wise felt that if a master had to be chosen, the best to choose was the King of France. Philip de Comines, the councillor of the Duke of Burgundy, and Odet d'Aydie, Sieur de Lescun, the two men most skilled in the understanding and practice of the art of politics, who loved the policy of ruses and success, both passed at this time into the service of Louis XI.

CHAPTER XXXV

THE REIGN OF LOUIS XI. (1472–1483)

The Duke of Burgundy and the Burgundian Possessions.—Philip de Comines and the Sieur de Lescun, the wise men of the period, were right, for they placed success before morality, and success was henceforth assured to the King of France. His most formidable adversary laboured from this time only to destroy himself.

Charles destroyed himself by pursuing an object the realisation of which was beyond his power. His states comprised the duchy and county of Burgundy in the basin of the Saône; the Low Countries at the mouths of the Scheldt, Meuse, and Rhine. One part was French, the other German; one feudal, the other communal. There was no communication between them, and to join them it was needful to hold either Champagne or Lorraine and Alsace. Charles had already tried to secure the former by causing it to be granted to the Duke of Guienne; he sought in turn to secure each of the other two. In the Flemish part of his dominions he had subjects hostile to each other; history attests the long rivalry between Holland and Belgium. The Burgundian state had neither frontiers, centre, national sovereign, nor common language, at a time when nations were becoming defined, when in all western Europe political unity was developing. Hence it could only be a fragile

dominion and, as it was altogether abnormal, of ephemeral duration.

One thing, however, might be supplied to the lands of Charles the Bold, a common frontier and physical barriers, if it were possible to secure the ancient Lotharingia, to acquire all the land from the Cevennes to the Alps, from the Rhine to the Scheldt. To gain this frontier was the aim of Charles; the difficulty of the task is obvious. He was compelled to resist successfully the power of France, Germany, Switzerland, Lorraine, and Provence, and when the frontier had been conquered, he would have had to weld together all these races—to cause to live together, as members of one family, the men of Marseilles and the men of Nimwegen; to seek for and find the central point of this long strip of territory, a centre which was in reality non-existent; to conquer the invincible communes of Flanders, the brave soldiers of Dauphiné, the Swiss mountaineers; to produce uniformity from the most profound divergences. The enterprise was foredoomed to failure, and its disastrous end was found under the walls of Nancy in 1477. But it was a great and serious undertaking, the details of which merit attention.

The first attempts at this impossible centralisation were made from 1468 to 1473. A treasurer-general for all the Burgundian lands was created (1468), a supreme court of justice founded at Malines, and a great military ordinance issued for the unity of the army.

Acquisitions in Gueldres, Lorraine, and Alsace (1469–1473).—But Charles the Bold concerned himself rather with conquests than with institutions. The old Duke Arnold of Gueldres having been imprisoned by his son Adolph, Charles made himself judge between father and son and decided for the father, who sold him the duchy (1469). The Duke of Lorraine died; Charles seized his heir, René de Vaudemont, and forced him to cede four strong places on his frontier with free passage through his domains (1473). In the same year, the Elector of Cologne, Robert of Bavaria, nominated Charles advocate and defender of the electorate. Sigismund, one of the perpetually necessitous Austrian archdukes, who was always in debt, had already mortgaged to him for a small sum the landgravate of Upper Alsace and the county of Ferrette. This was part of the district which formed the passage between Franche-Comté and Luxemburg, and from it Charles's agent, Hagenbach, menaced Berne, Basle, Mülhausen, Strasburg, the Rhine cities, and Switzerland (1469).

Charles Attempts to secure a Royal Coronation (1473).—Charles attempted to join a title to these acquisitions. He wished to secure public recognition of the real independence that he enjoyed and to exchange his ducal title for a royal one. He applied to the ancient dispenser of royal titles, the Roman Emperor, at that time Frederic III., a prince more concerned with the interests of his own family than with the empire. Charles the Bold offered him the hand of his daughter Mary (which had been already promised to several princes) for his son Maximilian, and with her the richest inheritance in Christendom; in exchange, Frederic was to raise the Burgundian possessions into a kingdom.

The matter was arranged, and an interview was fixed at Treves to settle the final details. But the Duke of Burgundy kept the emperor waiting; he appeared in such sumptuous state that the wretched following of the emperor seemed still more despicable. Neither of the two rulers wished to redeem his promise first. On the one hand, Charles had no real intention of giving himself a son-in-law who would embarrass him by his needs; on the other hand, Frederic feared to rouse resentment in the empire by increasing the already menacing power of the Duke of Burgundy. Disquieting news reached the emperor from Louis XI., and Frederic III. quited Treves, leaving word for Charles that their affair should be dealt with at a fitting time.

League against the Duke of Burgundy: Siege of Neuss (1474–1475).—At the same time the duke learned that a league had been formed by the Archduke Sigismund, the threatened Rhine towns, the Swiss, and the King of France. The archduke suddenly repaid the 100,000 florins agreed upon for the redemption of Alsace, which Charles was forced to give up. His agent, Hagenbach, whose tyrannical administration had pleased the duke, was seized and executed by the people of Brisach (1474). Along with this news, the duke received the solemn defiance of the Swiss who invaded Franche-Comté and had already defeated the Burgundians at the bloody Battle of Hericourt.

These events occurred at a time when Charles was already engaged on another war. He supported the Archbishop of Cologne, Robert of Bavaria, who had named him protector of his electorate, against the pope, the emperor, and his subjects, and laid siege to Neuss, near Cologne. Situated on a rock and well defended, Neuss resisted for eleven months, when the arrival of a large German army forced the duke to raise the siege. Charles

the Bold retired; he saw himself insulted and baffled. The Swiss had defied him; the Duke of Lorraine defied him; the King of France captured the towns of Picardy and invaded Artois; and the ally upon whom he had counted to occupy the attention of Louis signed a treaty of amity with France.

Expedition of Edward IV. to France (1475).—When he left for Germany, Charles pressed Edward IV. to invade France. The war suited the ideas of the English king who wished to rally round him all the parties by which his state was troubled, and who, with the help of the Duke of Burgundy and of the Constable St. Pol, hoped to wage a brief and glorious campaign. He landed at Calais at the head of a magnificent army, believing that he would find the duke there with all his forces. Charles met him almost alone to tell him that he was attacking on the side of Lorraine, but that the constable would open the fortresses, the gates of France, to him; he then went away. On this assurance the English king advanced towards the Somme and approached St. Quentin. The constable opened fire on him. Edward was already very angry with those who had called for his help and received him in this way; the skill of the French king did the rest. Louis first bought the herald who bore the defiance to him with 300 crowns, twenty yards of silk, and fair promises if he secured peace; then he bought some of the English barons, and finally the king himself.

He had to pay dear. Edward was to receive 75,000 crowns for the cost of the war and 50,000 crowns annual pension; his daughter was to marry the dauphin (August 29, 1475). The English army itself was entertained at open table in Amiens. "He had placed at the entrance of the city gate two tables, one on each side, filled with all good things that any one could wish to eat, the best wines procurable, and supplied with men to serve them. There was no thought of water. At each table five or six men of good family were seated; they were fat and lusty, the better to please those who wished to drink. When the English came near, they saw them seated; men seized their bridles and cried that they would break a lance with them. They were brought to the tables and made to sit down in great good humour, and they took the jest well. While they were in the city they paid nothing where they lodged, they were furnished with all things necessary where they ate and drank, they demanded what they would and paid nothing, and this went on for three or four days."

This was not heroic, but it was very profitable. Louis was con-

tent and allowed the people to give the treaty its true name, the merchant's peace.

Charles the Bold conquers Lorraine (1475) and invades Switzerland.—Edward having signed the peace, Charles the Bold was forced to come to terms, and concluded with Louis the Treaty of Soleure (September 13) in order to be free to finish his affairs in Lorraine and Switzerland. He thought that he would be able to deal with France later. Louis prudently cleared the wild boar's way. Though he had urged René to war he left him to fall. Charles the Bold entered Nancy (November 30), and less than two months later passed the Jura to subdue Switzerland, the Swiss having overrun Franche-Comté, burning and pillaging. The free peasants believed themselves to be the finest soldiers in the world, and so they were. Charles the Bold despised the "Alpine cowherds," attacked them in mid-winter with an army of 18,000 men, which had already made two fatiguing campaigns, and besieged the small town of Grandson (February 18, 1476). The place held out for ten days. To induce the defenders to submit, Charles promised them their lives: when he had taken the town he caused them to be hanged or drowned.

Battles of Granson and Morat (1476).—All Switzerland rose at the news of this treachery. The confederate army from Schwyz, Berne, Soleure, and Fribourg attacked the Burgundian troops while they were entangled in a narrow plain, where neither their artillery nor their cavalry had free play. The Swiss infantry, armed with eighteen-feet lances, did well against foes so embarrassed. Charles ordered a movement to the rear in order to deprive the enemy of this advantage of situation. His men were filled with panic, which was increased by the unexpected arrival of the contingents from Uri, Unterwald, and Lucerne. All the duke's efforts failed to stay a terrible rout. The loss was small; Comines says that only seven men-at-arms fell. But prestige had vanished; Charles of Burgundy was no longer Charles the Invincible. He had been beaten; he had fled. His sword, tent, diamonds, and ducal seal, his collar of the Golden Fleece and the furniture of his chapel, fell into the hands of the Swiss, and the laugh was with the rustics.

Having retreated to Lausanne, the duke had only one thought, that of vengeance. He summoned soldiers from all sides to form a new army, 4000 Italians, 3000 English, Savoyards, men from Franche-Comté, Burgundy, and Flanders, in all 30,000 soldiers. He left Lausanne (May 27) saying, "I will breakfast at Morat, dine at Fribourg, and sup at Berne." He arrived before Morat,

which repulsed ten assaults in ten days (June 22). Meanwhile the cantons assembled their forces and foreign help reached them. Louis sent no soldiers, but he sent money; troops arrived from Alsace and from Germany, despite the emperor, and René de Vaudemont, the young Duke of Lorraine, despoiled by the Duke of Burgundy, gave the Swiss the only thing they lacked, a few cavalry and some steel armour.

The Swiss army left Berne on June 21, 1476. Charles the Bold, amply warned, took no precautions; his artillery and cavalry were so placed that they could not act. The Swiss had reached his lines while he still refused to believe that they would dare to attack. They fell on the Burgundians with their habitual impetuosity, carried his batteries, enclosed the ducal army between their main body, the garrison of Morat, and the lake. They made a terrible butchery, 8000 or 10,000 men falling, besides those who were drowned.

Battle of Nancy: Death of the Duke of Burgundy (1477).—The great Duke of Burgundy, vanquished and a fugitive, assembled the States of Franche-Comté, Burgundy, and Flanders, to receive only humiliating refusals on all sides, to hear bitter and insulting speeches. All his enemies profited from his disaster, and he had to contend at once with the Swiss, with Louis XI., and with René. The attack of the last, coming from his weakest foe, affected him most. Lorraine was the bond between his various territories, the natural centre of the Burgundian empire, and it is said that he designed Nancy as the capital of his new kingdom. He hastened to save the place, but arrived before its walls three days after it had fallen (October 22). But the town had neither a garrison nor food, and keeping it closely blockaded, Charles hoped soon to re-enter it.

His enemies showed an activity equal to his obstinacy. Louis XI. and René hired mercenaries from the Germans and Swiss and the Duke of Lorraine appeared in sight of Nancy with 2000 men (January 4, 1477). Charles the Bold had only 4000 soldiers, but no remonstrance could move him to retire. "If it must be, I will fight alone," he said. On Sunday, January 5, he moved against the enemy through deep snow expecting rather to perish than to conquer. In a few minutes the little Burgundian army was dispersed, taken, or slain. The duke himself was killed by an unknown enemy and his mutilated body was found next day by one of his pages.

On January 7, Louis XI. had already learned this important news. "When the king received the letters, he sent to the city of

Tours to seek out all the captains and many other great personages and showed them the news. All gave signs of great joy, but it seemed to such as watched closely that this joy was somewhat forced, and that despite their actions they would have been glad if it had gone otherwise with the duke. The reason was perhaps that the king was already feared, and they expected that when he found himself freed from his enemies he would wish to change many things especially in the matter of lands and offices. For in that company were many who, in the matter of the Public Good and in other affairs of the Duke of Guienne, had found themselves in opposition to the king. After having talked a little to these men, Louis heard mass and caused a table to be set in his chamber where he made them all dine with him; his chancellor and others of his council were there and he spoke always of these matters. And it may be guessed with what appetite they dined; it is the truth that, whether for joy or for sorrow, none ate half his portion."

Humbling of the Nobles.—As soon as Louis had seen Charles the Bold attack the Germans, he realised, as was said, that he had only to let him alone; that the duke would be so injured or embarrassed that he would no longer be a formidable adversary. Louis accordingly seized this respite to reckon with those who had so often opposed him.

Ruin of the House of Alençon (1474).—In 1458 the Duke of Alençon, accused of having treated with the English, had been condemned to death and Charles VII. had commuted the sentence to imprisonment for life. At his accession, Louis XI., anxious to undo what his father had done, had opened the gates of his prison, and Alençon profited from his liberty to cause the murder of those who had borne witness against him. He made false money, joined the League of the Public Good and all the plots formed against the king; he even offered to sell to the Duke of Burgundy his duchy of Alençon and his county of Perche. In 1473 Louis caused him to be arrested and handed over to parliament, taking the precaution of distributing his property among his judges. His life was spared, but he was kept in prison till his death two years later.

He left a son, René, to whom the king paid a modest pension very irregularly. René was content, as he was in great fear of the king and because he would have been content with anything if he were left his pleasures and his hunting. But those to whom his property had been distributed always feared some inconvenient claim on his part. They wrote him anonymous letters.

The first told him that the king would make him a monk ; René was alarmed, having no vocation. The second stated that the king was about to imprison and try him, which meant condemn him ; the third, that the king had appointed agents to kill him. The count was forced to implore the protection of the Duke of Brittany and of the King of England. At once Louis was informed that the Count of Perche was preparing to fly to the enemies of the realm. To pass to England or Brittany was to Louis an unpardonable crime. René was arrested and shut up in an iron cage a foot and a half long, being fed by a fork through the bars (1481). He was kept there for twelve weeks, but written proof was wanting. One of his neighbours inspired him with confidence and went to him hastily one night saying, " By God's body, you are a dead man if you do not take care." He added that his brother had learned from a sure source that René was to be put to death and urged him to avail himself of the king's absence. The prisoner, in his terror, begged the man to supply him with the means of escape ; this he promised to do, but urged that it was needful first to write to the Duke of Brittany to demand protection from him. He gave the captive the means of sending this message ; the count wrote and his enemies secured the needed piece of evidence. The accused was condemned to beg pardon from the king and to imprisonment for life.

Ruin of the House of Armagnac (1473).—Louis had serious charges to bring against the Count of Armagnac, that dreadful John V. who had married his own sister, forced his chaplain to bless his incestuous union by threatening to throw him into the river if he made any difficulty, and drew his dagger on any who remonstrated with him. Tried before the parliament for incest, murder, and forgery, he was condemned under Charles VII., but escaped, and one of the first acts of Louis XI. had been to restore him his lands, with full pardon for all his crimes. Armagnac made the return which might have been expected. He was constantly among the enemies of the king, allied with the Duke of Burgundy, the Duke of Guienne, and the King of England. Louis XI. took the first opportunity of punishing him (1473), and employed for this purpose the Cardinal d'Alby, on whom he could count. The prelate besieged Lectoure with an army ; the town was defended and proposals for a capitulation were made to the count. While the negotiations were in progress and at the moment when the surrender was being signed, the cardinal carried a gate of the

town and then the town itself. John of Armagnac was stabbed before the eyes of his wife; the soldiers ranged through the houses, pillaged everything, murdered every one, and fired the houses, so that of the population only three men and four women survived. The wife of the count, who was with child, was poisoned.

Ruin of the House of Nemours (1477).—The house of Armagnac had a younger branch, the house of Nemours. In 1477, James of Armagnac, Duke of Nemours and Count of La Marche, being arrested, imprisoned, placed on trial, and condemned, wrote the following letter to Louis XI.: "Most dread and sovereign lord, as humbly as I can, I commend myself to your grace and mercy. I have done so many wrongs towards you and towards God that I see well I am lost if your grace and mercy be not extended to me, which, very humbly and in great grief and contrition of heart, I ask you and pray you freely to pardon me in honour of the blessed passion of Our Lord Jesus Christ, for the merits of the blessed Virgin Mary, and for the great mercy which she has shown to you. If this one sacrifice has redeemed the world I present it to you for my deliverance, poor sinner that I am, and for my entire absolution. Do not permit that for my sins I die in shame and confusion and that my poor children live in dishonour, seeking their bread. If you have love for my wife, your cousin, have pity on her wretched husband and her orphans. Sire, do not permit any judges of my cause other than your mercy, clemency, and pity. Sire, in honour of the blessed passion of the Redeemer, as humbly as I may, I beg pardon, grace, and pity. I will serve you so well and loyally that you shall see I am truly repentant and that as far as I can I wish to make amends for my wrong-doing. For God's sake, sire, have pity on me and my poor children. Extend your pity to them and they will never cease to serve you and pray to God for you. Whom I pray, of His goodness, to grant you a long and happy life, with the fulfilment of all your good desires. Written in a cage in the Bastille the last day of January, 1477. Your very humble and most obedient servant and subject, the poor James."

This letter was very touching, and the man who was not touched by such heartrending supplications must be pitied, though it may be added that the guilt of the criminal is not removed by repentance and prayers.

The Nemours family owed everything to Louis XI. With that unwise preference which he showed for some persons, he had

given to James of Armagnac, with the title of Duke of Nemours, vast possessions in the dioceses of Meaux, Châlons, Langres, and Sens. The king forced the judges to decide in favour of the duke in a shameful case. The League of the Public Good was formed and Nemours joined the rebels; at the Treaty of Conflans he returned to the king, swore fealty to him on the relics of the Sainte Chapelle, received from him the government of Paris and of the Ile de France, and less than a year later was again in the ranks of his enemies. In 1470, having seen his cousin of Armagnac condemned, he became alarmed, made a new submission, and took a new oath, the most solemn possible. His promise was vain. In 1475, in the midst of Louis' extreme embarrassment, the duke remained in his own lands awaiting the turn of events, and meanwhile, refusing all help to the king, he tried to seize Languedoc. Freed from the English, Louis besieged and took Nemours in his castle of Carlat, transported him to the Bastille, and placed him in chains in an iron cage. He ordered that he was only to be let out of it to be tortured, and that he was to be tortured severely that he might speak openly. He learned that some leniency was being shown the prisoner and at once wrote, "M. de Saint Pierre, I am ill content with that which you have told me, how he has had the irons on his limbs loosed and been allowed to go into another room to be dealt with. Take care that he does not again leave his cage, that he does not go outside unless it is to be tortured, and that he is tortured in his cell, and I ask you, if you have ever sought to do me service, that you make him speak." Judges to whom the king, according to his custom, had already distributed the goods of the accused, received the charge and began the trial. When he saw that condemnation was inevitable, Louis carried the case to the parliament that the sentence might be more solemn. Nemours avowed everything and wrote his suppliant letter to the king. This letter Louis merely added to the evidence, but it made some impression on the judges and three members of the parliament voted in favour of the accused. Louis suspended them from their office. The parliament complained in writing of this violence done to conscience. The king answered angrily, "Seeing that you are subjects of the French crown and owe loyalty to it, I thought you would not have approved action so contrary to my will. After reading your letters, I know well that there are still some plotters against my person among you, and that they may save themselves from punishment they wish to abolish the death penalty. It is therefore well that I should remedy

two things: first of all, to purge the court of such men and next to enforce the observance of the statute that I have made, that nothing may be allowed to excuse the crime of treason." Condemnation was pronounced and the duke was beheaded in the market. The story that his children were placed under the scaffold to be bathed in his blood is a modern invention, unknown even to the most hostile contemporaries.

Submission of the Southern Barons and Acquisition of Roussillon.—A brother of John V. of Armagnac and a member of the powerful house of Albret, guilty of plotting, were respectively imprisoned and beheaded, and these executions filled the southern barons, so often in rebellion, with respect for the law and the king. The King of Aragon had mortgaged for 200,000 crowns the district of Roussillon, and fomented a revolt in it, hoping to regain the province and keep the money. Louis sent a large army there, took Perpignan after a memorable siege, and closed this gate into France (1474).

Ruin of the House of St. Pol (1475).—There still remained one noble to punish in the north, a noble who, like Nemours, owed everything to Louis XI., who had given him money, domains, the command of Rouen, the government of Normandy, and the sword of France, with the title of Constable. The Count of St. Pol, who held both French and Flemish fiefs, resolved to create between England, France, and Burgundy an independent state; he worked for ten years for this object, deceiving in turn the English, French, and Burgundians. He especially deceived Louis XI., who despite all his finesse was easily hoodwinked. Louis became the most implacable of his foes when the event which St. Pol had not foreseen occurred, and the rulers of England, France, and Burgundy exchanged the letters which he had written to them and learned that they had each been duped in turn. At the approach of the French troops the constable believed that, in spite of everything, there remained a refuge for him with the Duke of Burgundy, the friend of his youth. He fled to Mons. The king wrote that he might return without fear. "I have great difficulties and have need of a head such as yours," he wrote, adding to those who were present, for fear that he might be thought a liar, "it is the head that I want; his body may remain where it is." St. Pol took care not to come; he thought that he was safer where he was, but he was wrong. The Duke of Burgundy and the king made an exchange; the former was allowed to work his will on René of Lorraine and the latter received the constable, who was removed to the Bastille,

questioned on things which he could not deny as they were written down, and executed on the Place du Grève with extreme promptitude by order of the king's men, some of whom saw that they might be compromised by the revelations by which St. Pol proposed to earn his pardon. The king often showed his regret that the constable had not been tortured in order to wring further confessions from him.

Extension of Royal Power.—These were the chief executions ordered by Louis XI. If the means employed and the barbarous procedure of the Middle Ages be forgotten, there is perhaps not one of these condemnations, with the exception of that of the Count of Perche, which would not have been pronounced at the present day. The existence of France depended on the realisation of two objects, unity of territory and unity of government. This dual unity, vaguely understood, was the aim of all Louis's acts. The object of his reign was the recovery of the fiefs and of the powers of the barons for the crown; he pursued this end or prepared the way for its attainment by every means, attacking in turn all the great families, either attaching them to himself or ruining them. He dealt with the families of Alençon, Armagnac, Nemours, St. Pol, and Albret by rigorous or bloody executions; with the house of Bourbon by threatening the trial of the aged Duke John and causing that prince's heir, Peter of Beaujeu, to enter his own family. He secured the house of Orleans by marrying his second daughter, Jeanne, to Duke Louis; the house of Anjou, by wresting from the old René and his nephew Charles a will which made him heir of Maine, Anjou, and Provence. As for the house of Brittany, the last and most vigorous of the great fiefs, he secured Angers, Le Mans, and Alençon, invited all Bretons to come to him who would accept his offers and who might one day serve him. Peter de Rohan became a marshal of France; Guy de Laval was made governor of Melun; Peter de Laval was made Archbishop of Reims. All these measures hastened the destruction or at least the humbling of that princely aristocracy, which had lately been so formidable to the crown, and which ceased to be dangerous as soon as its chief support, the redoubtable Duke of Burgundy, had fallen.

The Burgundian Succession: The House of Austria in the Low Countries.—The death of Charles the Bold opened a serious question for France. He left an only daughter, and the problem of the Burgundian succession arose. Louis XI. attempted to acquire it by marriage, but the same attempt was made by others. Five prospective husbands offered themselves; two

Englishmen, the Duke of Clarence and Lord Rivers, brother and brother-in-law of Edward IV.; two Germans, Adolph, Duke of Gueldres, who had been imprisoned for parricide, and Maximilian, Archduke of Austria, son of the Emperor Frederic III.; and one Frenchman, the Dauphin Charles, afterwards Charles VIII. The English claimants were soon dismissed, as the Flemings would not agree to a marriage which would have handed over their industry, their most cherished possession, to England. The French alliance was equally impossible, as it would have been the union of a child of eight to a princess of twenty, while the Flemings would never have accepted a count who was also King of France, and thus too powerful for them. Louis XI. realised this and sought to secure his gains beforehand. In the case of Picardy he put forward the right of recovery by the crown, stipulated in the Treaty of Arras; in Artois, he put forward the right of confiscation for the injuries which the Duke of Burgundy had done him. In Burgundy he alleged the right of wardship; he was eager to act as guardian for his good relative and daughter, whom he proposed, he said, though he had certainly given up the idea, to marry to his son, the dauphin. On all these grounds he seized and confiscated and arranged to hold what he had taken. Thus he declared Our Lady the Countess of Boulogne, and received the town to hold in fief for her, doing her homage and swearing to defend her well. He increased the privileges of the town of Arras, an important barrier of the kingdom, and after having regained the French provinces, invaded the imperial and Flemish lands, in Franche-Comté, Hainault, and Brabant.

That he might not be disturbed in these conquests, Louis took care to stir up trouble in Flanders. The Flemings, ill-treated by Charles the Bold, saw in his death a veritable deliverance. The duke had left only a daughter of twenty, a fortunate circumstance for the Flemings; they would marry this princess at their pleasure and would first make her promise that she would rule only by the advice of the States of Flanders. She promised and at the same time wrote to Louis XI. that her two advisers would be Burgundians, the Chancellor Hugonet and the Sieur d'Humbercourt, servants of her father. Louis then did a disgraceful thing: he showed this letter to the deputies of Ghent, when the people, enraged against the two councillors, put them to death. The young countess never forgave Louis the humiliation which he had caused her to suffer, and despite the King of France, despite her own subjects, who wished to marry her to Adolph of Gueldres, the brigand whom they had released from

prison, she gave herself and her rich heritage to Maximilian of Austria, one of numerous princes to whom her father had promised her. The marriage was concluded on April 27, 1477. Oliver the Devil, Louis's barber, who was sent to Ghent with a pompous embassy and with the title of Count of Meulan to oppose the match, failed to prevent it.

In modern times, royal marriages are merely family events, often unnoticed in history, since they rarely exercise any influence on the fate of nations. It was different at the close of the Middle Ages, when the bride had as dower a city, a province, or a people; when states were made and unmade solely on account of the unions of their rulers. Among these princely marriages, that of Maximilian of Austria to Mary of Burgundy is of vital importance in history owing to its consequences. The son of this union, Philip the Handsome, married the heiress of Castille and Aragon; the Castillian, Aragonese, Burgundian, and Austrian possessions were united in a single hand, and there arose the monstrous power of Charles V. and the struggle of France and Europe against the house of Austria.

Battle of Guinegate (1479).—That struggle, as it originated under Louis XI., had not the importance it acquired later. With the help of a subtle distinction which he produced between taking and occupying, Louis entered into Hainault, took or occupied Cambrai, Bouchain, Le Quesnoy, Avesnes, and Thérouanne. At the assault on Quesnoy, he saw young Raoul de Lannoy in the thick of the enemy. The king was brave, whatever was said about him, and loved bravery in others. He caused Lannoy to come to him, hung a chain of gold worth 500 crowns round his neck, and said, "By the Sacrament, my friend, you are too rash in battle. You must be chained up, for I do not wish to lose you, wishing you to serve me more than once." But the Flemings were angry at these encroachments, and determined to retake this last town. Crèvecœur, the general of Louis XI., came to the relief of Thérouanne, and descending a hillock met Maximilian, who had arrived with the Flemish militia, 27,000 men and 850 lances. Crèvecœur had half as many infantry and twice as many men-at-arms. With his mass of cavalry he charged, pursued Maximilian's men-at-arms, and forgot his own infantry on the battlefield. The free archers, left alone, were roughly handled. The French garrison of Thérouanne made a sortie to take the enemy in the rear, but unfortunately came to the enemy's camp on their way and waited to pillage it.

When Crèvecœur returned from the pursuit, he found that all was lost and that only flight remained to him. Maximilian gained nothing but the honour of holding the field, being unable even to retake Thérouanne. He retired to Flanders where he found himself involved in a host of difficulties. At Ghent the people had risen in revolt against a surtax of some liards (a quarter of a sou) on small beer; in Gueldres there was a rising of the province which wished to regain its independence and to have as ruler a descendant of one of its old dukes; in Holland there were the bloody factions of the *hameçons* and *morues*.[1] Maximilian used up his last resources in escaping from these difficulties, he pledged his wife's jewels, and fell ill of despair.

Treaty of Arras (1482): The King retains Half the Burgundian Inheritance.—These last years were very profitable to the King of France. Good news and inheritances came to him one after another. In 1480 René died, in 1481 his nephew Charles, and thus in virtue of the wills which they had made Maine, Anjou, and Provence passed to Louis XI. On March 27, 1482, Mary of Burgundy died. She sustained a severe internal injury by a fall from her horse, and died rather than tell the doctors. She left two children, Philip and Margaret, but the Flemings nominated a council of regency and did not leave Maximilian even the shadow of authority. As a German prince, he utterly failed to appreciate liberty and tried to act as he had done in Austria, seizing and hanging some recalcitrant burghers, and thus ruining his credit. The Flemings turned to the King of France and offered their little Princess Margaret to the dauphin, with the French provinces of the Burgundian house as her dower. Louis only counted on the towns of Picardy and the duchy of Burgundy. The Flemings of their own accord added what did not really belong to them, the county of Burgundy and the county of Artois. On such terms, the Treaty of Arras was concluded with ease (December 23, 1482).

This King of France, who was talked of by all, who negotiated everywhere, intrigued, inflicted severe punishments in his realm, bought at great expense lions from Africa, mules from Sicily, reindeer from Sweden, horses from England, and dogs from Spain, as though he had been a tireless hunter—the Flemish envoys found this king in the heart of his château of Plessis les Tours, which was less a château than a fortress and a prison, with iron gratings, iron doors, bridges, towers, and soldiers. When they had passed drawbridges and bastions, they found themselves in the

[1] Opprobrious epithets; literally *fish-hooks* and *codfish*.

evening in a little, ill-lighted chamber; in the corner of this chamber they saw a man almost entirely hidden under rich furs. This was Louis XI., for the last two years struck down by paralysis, knowing that he was dying and yet filling all Europe with his activity, becoming more distrustful and severe as he felt himself growing weaker, holding with all his might to the remnants of life and to his power. Speaking with difficulty, he told the envoys that he was unable to rise or to uncover himself; then he caused the Gospel to be brought to him that he might swear. They would excuse him, he said, if he swore touching the book with his left hand; his right hand was somewhat feeble. He was already well-nigh dead. Then, suddenly reflecting that a treaty sworn on the left hand might well be one day annulled on this ground, he made an effort and touched the Gospel with his right elbow.

Acquisitions made During this Reign.—Whether with his left hand or his right elbow, this moribund king received four rich provinces, Picardy, Artois, the county of Boulogne, and the duchy and county of Burgundy, with Charolais and Auxerre. A will had given him three other provinces, Maine, Anjou, and Provence. By legal process he secured the duchy of Alençon and Perche; by the death of his brother he secured Guienne; by his intervention in the affairs of Spain he secured Roussillon and Cerdagne. Eleven provinces were thus added to the royal demesne in a single reign, in addition to the profit made by the execution of St. Pol, Nemours, and Armagnac. A great step had been taken towards unity of territory and a decisive blow struck at the power of the nobles. The great men had been spared neither in their persons nor in their lands, their rights had been no more respected than their persons. The aristocracy was vanquished, the monarchy exalted, while to avoid new difficulties for the crown, Louis only employed small men who could be easily plunged back again into their original obscurity.

Foreign Affairs: Relations with England and Aragon.—The numerous activities of the king at home, important as they were, did not entirely prevent action abroad. France began to regain the premier position which she had held more than once. Her alliance was sought everywhere; Castille, Venice, and Scotland gloried in it, Bohemia and Hungary desired it. Louis XI. was named burgher of the Swiss cantons and their first ally. Six thousand Swiss served in his armies; Scots formed his guard. He was the protector of Lorenzo di Medici at Florence, supporting him even against the pope; of Galeazzo Sforza at

Milan; of the young King of Navarre, the young Dukes of Savoy and Gueldres. He had the wisdom to use these alliances only in so far as they helped him, and he refused to engage in the adventurous policy which they suggested. The Genoese offered him the lordship of their town; it would have been a useless and dangerous possession beyond the Alps. "The Genoese have given themselves to me; I give them to the devil." But if he would make no risky conquests, he strongly desired such as were necessary. The King of Aragon had mortgaged Roussillon and Cerdagne to him in 1462 and was very anxious to regain them; Louis successfully defeated such attempts and took all measures to secure one of the natural frontiers of France.

Germany under Frederic III. did not cause France any uneasiness. Louis was afraid of England, though he was prepared by the Treaty of Arras to break off the marriage which had been arranged at the Treaty of Pecquigny between the dauphin and a daughter of Edward IV. Louis saw that the English king would soon be carried off by his excesses and he was right.

Last Days of Louis XI. (1483.)—But at the age of sixty years the King of France was also dying, and he made a thousand efforts to retain his life. He implored the King of Naples to send him "the most holy man, Francis de Paul, before whom he fell on his knees that he might be pleased to prolong his life." The Sultan Bajazet sent him relics found at Constantinople, asking in return only that Louis would guard strictly his brother Zizim, the Duke of Guienne of the Ottoman Empire. The king had the sacred ampulla brought from Reims and proposed to be anointed from head to foot. The people circulated reports that Louis made terrible and marvellous medicines; that to rejuvenate himself, he drank the blood of children. Remedies, prayers, and the will to live were useless. Nothing was of any avail; he had to go the way of all flesh, says Comines. Those around him, whom he had always ordered to break to him gently the news of approaching danger, told him brusquely that he must die. At last he resigned himself to fate, sent for his son, the dauphin, gave him the usual excellent advice, and expired on August 24, 1483.

New Parliaments: Postes: Favour shown to the Burghers.—Louis granted permanency of office to magistrates (1467), a curious grant from such a ruler. He extended the activity of the government in distant provinces by establishing *postes* (1464), which for a century served only the needs of the king and the

pope; by creating the parliaments of Grenoble, Bordeaux, and Dijon, and by establishing an appeal to the royal courts from manorial courts. To secure the affection of new provinces and to preserve that of the old, he maintained or created provincial states. During his reign, the three orders assembled in Champagne, Dauphiné, Périgord, Guienne, Normandy, Languedoc, and Provence, and the king heard their complaints. To gain the burghers, and to find in their devotion support against the nobles, he allowed them to buy the right which the nobles had had of commanding the watch, and thus destroyed feudal influence in the towns. He often authorised assemblies of burghers, free election of magistrates, and the grant of noble rank to the holders of certain municipal offices.

Encouragement of Commerce, Printing, and Literature: Comines.—Louis XI. did not prefer municipal to aristocratic independence. He would allow neither. If he beat down the great fiefs, if he executed St. Pol and Nemours, the burghers who rose against the increased taxation were cruelly treated. Many perished, being hanged to the trees along the roads or thrown into the river, sewn in sacks on which was written, "Let the justice of the king proceed!" Everything bent before his sovereign will; he left the monarchy covered with blood but feared by the nobles for its strength and respected by the people because it guaranteed public peace, the safety of the roads, and was already interested in the great concerns of modern states, commerce and industry. One day when he heard that his troops had pillaged he wrote at once to Dammartin, "I pray you, that you do not allow pillage another time, for you must be as good an officer of the crown as I am, and if I am king you are grand master."

"One merit," says Comines, "our good master had. He put nothing into the treasury; he took all and spent all. He made great buildings for the fortification and defence of the towns and places of his kingdom and did more than any of the kings before him."

He improved the public roads and gathered round him the ablest merchants to advise as to means of increasing the prosperity of commerce and industry. He multiplied fairs and markets; granted privileges to peasants who engaged in foreign trade, and allowed nobles and ecclesiastics to engaged in this work on condition that they used French ships. He attracted the merchants of the Low Countries to French fairs by abolishing for them tolls and river dues, and by similar inducements drew

to Lyons the traders of Savoy and neighbouring lands, who had previously only frequented the market of Geneva.

Craftsmen from Venice, Genoa, and Florence founded the first silk manufactories at Tours, and Louis also encouraged one of the oldest French industries, that of mining.

"To avoid fraud and trickery," says Comines, "he established unity of laws, weights, and measures in the kingdom and ordered that all the customs should be written down in a fair book." This great work was not a mere compilation but a work of legislation, since Louis caused laws of foreign lands, especially those of Venice and Florence, to be studied and collected, and he doubtless borrowed much from the admirable civil government of the great Italian republics.

It must also be noted of this prince that he had literary tastes, that he encouraged learned men, founding or reorganising the universities of Valence, Bourges, and Besançon and many schools of law and medicine. He received with favour Gutenberg's new invention of printing. Villon flourished under Louis XI.; his councillor, Comines, is one of the great French historians. Louis did not love the disputes of the schools. Weary of the quarrels of the scholastic philosophers, he caused their writings to be chained up in the libraries and made the professors swear that they would no longer teach the nominalist doctrines. This singular interdict was withdrawn seven years later (1481).

Character of Louis XI.—Louis XI. contributed more than any other king to found the French monarchy, and is in some respects the representative of the new spirit in politics. By giving nothing to birth and all to merit he prepared for intellect the position which it holds in modern society, though intellect with Louis XI. was too often merely ruse and perfidy. He attempted to make public interest prevail over private interests, but he gave to the severe measures which the welfare of France required the appearance of personal vengeance. Where he was concerned only with territorial unity he seemed to be satisfying his royal greed; where he was concerned only with unity of administration he seemed to be actuated by the hateful jealousy of a despot amusing himself. He had to destroy a feudal society, already undermined though still tenacious of its position, and bound either to give way or to perish. It resisted, fought, and perished; but the fight was so waged that pity was on the side of the vanquished and that the rights of the conqueror were forgotten, the right of the crown to establish peace and order in the realm. Louis XI. fulfilled his duty in this regard; but too often he bent

the moral rule which should never vary. He must be judged by a higher standard of morality than that of Comines, who appreciated all his master's acts, saying, " God will pardon a prince who knows good and evil as did the king our master." Another historian, Duclos, says, " Louis XI. was equally renowned for his vices and his virtues and when the two are balanced he was a king." France certainly owes him much, though she may be unable to agree with all the means which he used to attain an admirable end.

CHAPTER XXXVI

THE REIGN OF CHARLES VIII. FROM 1483 TO 1491

The Royal Family : Charles VIII.: Anne of Beaujeu: Jeanne of France.—Charles VIII., aged thirteen years and two months, was the youngest child of the late king. " Of short build, with a large head, a thick neck, large and protruding breast and shoulders, long and thin thighs and legs "—such is the unflattering portrait of him left by his contemporaries. His moral character was in some respects even worse than his physical appearance. His father had composed or caused to be written under his supervision a book of policy for him, the *Rosier des guerres*. He was little attracted by the sickly child, who was also of feeble intellect, and kept him at Amboise far from the court, consoling himself for being unable to make him study by reflecting that the prince would at least understand enough to know that " he who cannot dissimulate cannot reign." If he did understand the saying he ignored it, but it is doubtful if he was able to read the words. This sad prince was King of France, in possession of absolute power because he had entered his fourteenth year and the majority of the king was fixed by law at thirteen years.

This legal fiction was not abused. It was well known that all authority, apparently entrusted to a child, was really in the hands of his sister, Anne of France, who had married Peter of Beaujeu, of the house of Bourbon. This lord, a younger member of a great family, gave little support to a princess of twenty-two, who had on her side neither her father's will, nor her brother's affection, nor the laws of the kingdom, nor the advantages of experience, but only the merit of uniting in her person many of the qualities of Louis XI., who had said of her, when he entrusted her with the care of the young king's education and

health, " She is the least foolish woman in the world, for none of them are wise."

The third child of Louis XI., Jeanne of France, was three years younger than her sister, small, thin, dark, hunchbacked, so unprepossessing that her father could not bear to see her. When she did appear before him, she always used to hide behind her governess. Married in 1476 to Louis of Orleans she had not found in this union, which was only the pledge of a political reconciliation, more happiness than she had found in her own family, and she was destined to have more evidence of the nature of her marriage.

The Duke of Orleans and the Duke of Bourbon.—Her husband, Louis of Orleans, was twenty-one years of age; he was much occupied with gallantry, fêtes, and tournaments; he could jump fifteen feet ditches and would tame fierce horses in the palace court. In his view these were royal occupations and qualities. Alexander had begun his reign in that way. In conjunction with his position as first prince of the blood they would assure him the supreme power in the state. But being a man of pleasure rather than of intrigue he was content to be regarded as a model knight, but for his two young cousins, the Counts of Angoulême and Dunois, who urged him forward that they might possess themselves of power. The old Duke of Bourbon had similar pretensions, but he, the elder brother of the Sieur de Beaujeu, had been confined to his bed by gout for eight years and was easily satisfied with a share. The essential thing was that the aristocratic principle should be revived as in the time of the kings of the past, that the days of the princes and nobles might return.

Aristocratic Reaction.—Princes and nobles set to work without delay. Orleans granted himself a pension of 24,000 livres, a company of 100 lances, and the lieutenancy general of the Ile de France, Picardy, and Champagne. Count Dunois was to receive a pension of 4000 ducats and the government of Dauphiné; the Count of Angoulême 20,000 livres and a company of ordnance; the Duke of Lorraine 36,000 livres, 100 lances, and the duchy of Bar, while his claims to the inheritance of Provence and Anjou were being examined; the Duke of Bourbon was to receive the titles of constable and lieutenant-general of the kingdom with the salaries and advantages attached to these functions. Finally the king was to be disarmed by sending away the 6000 Swiss whom Louis had had in his pay. Vengeance and greed were alike satisfied. An ordinance attacked all whom

Louis XI. had treated well, by revoking all alienations of the demesne which he had made. One by one the late king's "evil councillors" were to be taken and punished. Oliver the Devil and Daniel his worthy assistant were hanged and their goods confiscated for the benefit of Orleans. John Doyat, having been scourged, had his tongue pierced and his ears cut off; the doctor, Coictier, was exiled after restoring 50,000 crowns. If the friends of Louis XI. were ill-treated his old enemies fared well. The Count of Perche was freed and became Duke of Alençon; Poncet de Rivière, one of those who had stirred up Charles the Bold at Peronne, was made mayor of Bordeaux; the goods of the Prince of Orange were restored; and Philip of Savoy, Count of Bresse, returned to court to take rank with the princes of the blood. The reaction did not cease here. Those whom Louis XI. had caused to be executed, John of Armagnac, who had been guilty of incest and murder; James of Nemours, ten times traitor to state and king, were converted into innocent victims, and the brother of the one, the children of the other, claimed justice, rehabilitation, and most of all restitution. That the counter-revolution might be complete, that as little as possible of the work of Louis XI. might survive him, it was essential that the whole government should pass into the hands of the princes. But that aristocracy had been so hardly used in the previous period that it lacked the courage to put forward great claims. The question of sovereign power, which it should have decided for its own interest in its own favour, was committed for decision to the States-General, summoned to meet at Tours on January 4, 1484. Orleans had not the least fear that the States would assist him to replace his sister-in-law; Anne on her side was sure that they would enable her to curb all this young ambition.

States-General of 1484.—These states were really the first national assembly in France. All the districts of the north and south sent deputies; each order named its own, even the peasants, who were then called for the first time to exercise in the primary assemblies their political rights. As a result the states of 1484 mark the appearance of the rural population in public life, as those of 1302 had marked the appearance of the urban population, or rather, the end of the fifteenth century marks the definitive union of the burghers and the peasants, the formation of the third estate. In the body of the assembly the deputies, instead of being divided and voting by orders, separated into six bodies, corresponding to the six great territorial divisions,

and thus foreshadowed the future union of the orders which occurred three centuries later. No assembly, unless perhaps that which Marcel directed, had so boldly proclaimed national rights.

On January 15 the royal sitting took place in the great hall of the archbishop's palace, which was divided into two sections. In the first, which was four feet higher than the second, was the young king's throne; on his right hand was seated at some distance the constable and on his left the chancellor. Between them and the throne were Count Dunois, the Sieur d'Albret, the Count of Foix, and the Prince of Orange. Further back were seated two cardinals, six ecclesiastical peers, and six princes of the blood or lay peers; twenty lords were behind them. On the lower floor the deputies of the nation were ranged on semicircular benches. On the first were the bishops, barons, and knights; on the second the other deputies. The chancellor, William de Rochefort, pronounced a long and confused oration, in which he cited at haphazard Juvenal, Caesar, St. Jerome, Pythagoras, Plato, Persius, Augustus, Boethius, Cicero, Clothaire, St. Louis, Solomon, Sallust, Horace, David, and Scipio Africanus. What the chancellor wished to say in the midst of this deluge of learning was that the king wished to know his people and to be known by them; that economy of expenses was to be introduced, that reforms had been initiated and were to be carried through, that the king could provide for his personal expenses from the revenues of his demesnes, and that it was necessary to appeal to the States for the revenue which the security of the kingdom required. When they had satisfied this demand the king, whom the chancellor called a second Solomon, the father of his country, and the founder of peace, whose remarkable beauty they were called upon to admire, would hear with kindness the complaints and remonstrances of his people. He would repress all abuses and prepare the happiness of his realm, taking justice as his guide in all his acts; making those royal virtues, gravity, majesty, temperance, continence, and forethought, his constant companions, while there would not be wanting to him constancy, truth, patience, knowledge, purity of conscience, and the sacred college of other virtues.

Next day the States formed their six committees or nations of France, Burgundy, Normandy, Aquitaine, Languedoc, and Provence. They chose as president the Abbot of St. Denis, the first deputy of Paris, and set to work to draw up their lists of grievances. This work was finished early in February and discussion began.

An important question was raised, that of the wardship and education of the king. Some deputies urged that the national assembly had no right to concern itself with the tutelage of the king or the regency, that by the essence of monarchical power these duties devolved on the royal family, and that if the king could not exercise his functions personally they fell by right to the princes of the blood. This view found an eloquent opponent in Philip Pot, Lord of La Roche, deputy of the nobles of Burgundy, who made a speech of remarkable boldness. "To whom will you give the tutelage of the young king? To his nearest relative? But then you will have reason to fear that he will free himself of his ward to reign himself. Is it suggested that the regency of the kingdom should be given to the nearest relative and the guardianship of the king's person to the next relative? This affords no better guarantee than the previous suggestion and there is no law authorising such a division of authority. Is it suggested, as some say, that all the princes of the blood have the right to share in the regency? The princes of the blood are innumerable if all the descendants, male and female, are considered; they are numerous even if only the males are considered; how would so many individuals agree, and if they failed to agree what recourse have they but to arms? And recourse to arms is just what it is desired to avoid. It can be avoided only by recognising a sovereign power, in which authority resides, which cannot be divided; that authority rests with the people or in the States-General composed of their representatives. As history relates, and as I have learned from my fathers, in the beginning the sovereign people created kings by election and gave preference to such as were pre-eminent for virtue and ability. Each people chose a king for its own advantage. The princes truly are princes, not to make profit from the people or to grow rich at their expense, but, forgetting their own interest, to enrich the people and to lead them to welfare. If they have sometimes done otherwise they are tyrants and evil shepherds who have eaten their sheep themselves, adopting the manners and name of wolves rather than the manners and name of shepherds. It is of extreme importance to the people what law and what chief directs it, for if the king is good the people will be good and if the king is evil the people will be evil. Have we not often read that the state is a republic, the property of the people? Shall the people then neglect to care for it? Why do flatterers say that the prince's sovereignty does not derive from the people? Is it because among the Romans all

the magistrates were not elected? Is it not true that every law, before enforcement, should be approved by the people? In many lands the king is still elected according to the ancient practice."

The States were, then, according to this orator, the depositaries of supreme power; nothing could be done without their advice and consent; it was pointed out that this power had been exercised under Philip IV. and his sons, at the accession of Philip of Valois, and under the regency of Charles V. The discussion was interrupted by a royal séance in which John de Rely, canon and deputy of Paris, addressed a long harangue to the king, which affords a singular picture of contemporary eloquence, half being in Latin, half in French, the text intermingled with quotations. After this the lists of grievances were read for three hours, at the end of which the canon found that the king was sound asleep, and the sitting was adjourned for two days.

Organisation of the New Government.—In the interval between the two sittings, the deputies tried to agree on the nomination of the members of the council, but they reached futile decisions, leaving all to the king, with a mere recommendation that the council should include twelve deputies from the States. In the absence of the king, Orleans presided over this council; in his absence, the Duke of Bourbon, then the Sieur de Beaujeu. Anne of Beaujeu was not named in this act; on the contrary, the Duke of Orleans was nominal head of the government and believed himself to be its real head. But Anne had taught her brother to fear and obey her, by making him preside at the council. She removed Orleans, while by making her husband preside she also removed the Duke of Alençon, the Count of Angoulême, and the other princes of the blood who were unwilling to sit below a simple baron. Thus a form of government was constituted which no one had foreseen, that of "Madame la Grande," as she was called, by which the firm and energetic rule of Louis XI. was continued.

Situation of the Kingdom according to the Cahiers of the States.—In addition to the chapter dealing with the council, the *cahiers* of the States contained five other chapters, dealing with the Church, the nobles, the third estate, justice, and commerce, which indicate the condition of the kingdom at the time. The *cahier* of the Church contained only two important demands, that the king should be crowned without delay and that he should restore the liberties of the Church as defined by the Councils of Constance and Basle and which the Pragmatic Sanction of

Bourges had guaranteed to France. The *cahier* of the nobles demanded indemnities for military service and the right of hunting in the demesnes which Louis XI. had taken away. The *cahier* of the third estate set out the extreme misery to which the people had been reduced by the intolerable burden of taxation, by the exactions of the court of Rome, which caused, it was said, all money to flow into Italy. Also by the exactions of the soldiery, who travelled incessantly from province to province and were billeted on the labourers, and that "after they had paid the the tax entitling them to be defended and not pillaged by the army; the soldiers were not content with what they found in the cottages, but forced the cottagers with blows to go and find wine for them in the town, white bread, fish, and spices. The inhabitants of many villages, whose cattle had been seized, were themselves yoked to the waggons; others, that their beasts might not be seized, dared only work in the fields at night." The deputies of Anjou, Maine, and the surrounding district stated that in their provinces more than 500 persons had been put to death in two years only on the ground that they had smuggled salt. As a remedy for these evils, the States demanded that the pensions granted to lords should be suppressed or greatly reduced; that the king should cut down the number of his men-at-arms to the number that Charles VII. had maintained and oblige them to observe the ordinances; "that taxes should not be imposed or exacted without prior authorisation by the three estates and without their cause and the needs of the king and kingdom being stated." In the chapter on justice, the States demanded the suppression of the sale of judicial offices, the abolition of judicial commissions and provost judges, the fixing of the cost of justice at a moderate price, and, finally, that all useful reforms might be effected and that good order might be maintained. The representatives of the nation demanded that the lord king should declare and approve that the States should meet two years after the present meeting, and in future every two years. In the chapter on commerce, the States demanded the moderation of tolls, the good preservation of bridges and roads, which should be made safe.

Dissolution of the Assembly.—An important question, the amount of taxation, remained to be settled. Before deciding it, the States demanded to know all the revenues, but were able only to secure falsified accounts; they eventually granted for two years the same tax that had been paid to Charles VII., allowance being made for the depreciation of the coinage. The discussion

then degenerated into shameful quarrels between the provinces, each trying to escape some part of the common burden. A discussion as to the payment due to the deputies increased the discredit of the States; the third estate voted that each estate should pay its own deputies, which the nobles and clergy refused, though they at last gave way at the instance of the chancellor. The assembly was dissolved on March 15, 1484, when the king's answers to the demands in the *cahiers* were published; they were almost uniformly favourable. But as no ordinance resulted, after so much discussion, no reform was effected in the government.

First Revolt of the Duke of Orleans (1485–1488).—The Duke of Orleans was a great figure at the fêtes and tournaments which were held to celebrate the coronation of Charles. The duke's fine appearance, knightly manners, and taste for dissipation and pleasure made a deep impression on the mind of the young king, over whom he gained a degree of influence which disquieted Anne of Beaujeu. She also heard of the prince's secret plans against her power, and dealt with the difficulty in a manner worthy of a daughter of Louis XI. She suddenly sent a force of soldiers into Paris with orders to seize the Duke of Orleans, who was then in the market playing tennis with Count Dunois and some others. They had only time to jump on the first horses they could find and fly at full speed. Orleans, declared a rebel, attracted to his side the Duke of Brittany, Francis II., and allied with Maximilian, who regretted the concessions made in the Treaty of Arras, and even asked help from Richard III. of England. Anne of Beaujeu brought all these plans to nothing. She kept Richard III. in his own kingdom by giving help in men and money to his rival, Henry of Richmond, who soon became King Henry VII. She treated with the states of Flanders against Maximilian, whose opponents acted in the name of their young prince, Philip of Austria; and she allied with the nobles of Brittany against Landais, the hated minister of Francis II. Landais was seized and hanged. La Trémoille besieged Orleans in Beaugency, took him and forced him to return to court with a promise that he would occupy himself with his pleasures for the future. To keep him better in check, Anne removed Dunois, whom she exiled to Italy.

The Fool's War: Battle of St. Aubin du Cormier (1486–1488).—But Maximilian, who had some months before been nominated King of the Romans and was heir to the imperial crown, broke the Treaty of Arras. The league of princes revived, a true

League of the Public Good. Anne had not made the mistakes of Louis XI., she had greater resources and used them ably. While d'Esquerdes checked Maximilian in Artois (1487) and there took St. Omer and Thérouanne, Anne put herself at the head of a small army, devoted to the young king, who was delighted to see himself in fair armour on horseback, and advanced against the confederates of the south. Everywhere the burghers armed themselves against the lords and against their garrisons; in a few days, the needs of the south had been satisfied. Anne returned to attack Brittany, which La Trémoille invaded with the French troops (April, 1488), taking Chateaubriand, Ancenis, and Fougères, and meeting the Breton army near St. Aubin du Cormier (July 27). The Bretons spent part of the morning in confessing and receiving the communion; then they drew themselves up before a village, covering one of their wings with their waggons while the other rested on a forest. Marshal de Rieux commanded the advance-guard; the Sieur d'Albret the main body; a Chateaubriand the rear-guard; while the Duke of Orleans and the Prince of Orange were on foot among the infantry. La Trémoille had a powerful force of artillery; he fired at this strong position in order to effect a breach. A German captain, finding himself in a very exposed position, withdrew his men a little to one side in order to avoid the fire and left a gap in the line of battle. The French gendarmerie at once hurled themselves into this opening and cut through the opposing force. At the same time, some Italian *condottieri* in the service of France turned the Breton flank and cut down their infantry from the rear. The Breton cavalry, who were on the wings, fled after a short resistance; the infantry fought better, but were severely handled, three or four thousand being left on the field of battle, while the prisoners also were numerous. The Duke of Orleans was captured in the wood as he tried to rally the fugitives; the Prince of Orange was recognised as he tried to hide among the dead, and the arrest of these two important personages completed the ruin of their party.

According to a tragic but somewhat doubtful story, Louis de la Trémoille, returning to his lodging after the battle, invited to his table the Duke of Orleans, whom he placed beside him, the Prince of Orange, who also sat beside him, and some captive knights. At the end of the meal he caused two Franciscans to enter the hall. Terror seized the guests, who realised only too well the reason for the presence of the confessors. La Trémoille rose and said, "Princes, my power does not extend over you, and if you

were subject to it, I would not exercise it ; I send you to the king to be judged. But you, knights, who, as far as you could, have given occasion for this war by breaking your faith and being false to your vows of chivalry, shall pay to-day with your heads for your crime of treason. If you have any burden on your consciences, see, here are monks to take your confession." Then he caused them to be taken into the courtyard and put to death, out of hand. The Duke of Orleans and the Prince of Orange were taken to France under close guard and imprisoned. The duke, heir-presumptive to the throne though he was, was kept for three years in the great tower of Bourges.

Things went equally well in the north. The Flemings, who had risen against Maximilian, expelled his German troops from their land and forced him to sign a new convention on the basis of the Treaty of Arras of 1482. Thus Anne of Beaujeu defeated all the coalitions and preserved her father's gains. She went further and added a large province to them. La Trémoille summoned Rennes to open its gates. The burghers answered that the king had no rights over them and that there were 20,000 men in the city to answer the attackers. Instead of putting them to the test, La Trémoille turned towards Dinan, which capitulated on terms, and to St. Malo, where the garrison shamefully surrendered. But negotiations were on foot, and on August 20, 1488, the Treaty of Sablé was signed. The Duke of Brittany engaged to send back all foreigners who had made war on the king, and no longer to receive his enemies ; the duke promised that he would not marry his daughters without the advice and consent of the king, who, on his side, agreed to treat them as dear relatives. The states of the province bound themselves with 200,000 gold crowns to observe these promises, while the French occupied as guarantees the four towns, St. Malo, Fougères, Dinan, and St. Aubin du Cormier.

Marriage of Charles VIII. with Anne of Brittany : Acquisition of that Province (1491).—Three weeks after the Treaty of Sablé, Francis II. died. The marriage of his daughter, Anne (the other daughter dying shortly afterwards), became a question of European importance. Was or was not Brittany, the last of the great fiefs, to be reunited to the domains of the King of France ? The sovereigns of Europe took the most lively interest in the independence of the province. Henry VII. promised troops and money ; Ferdinand of Aragon sent them. The aspirants to the hand of the duchess were numerous ; the Viscount de Rohan demanded her for his son ; the Sieur d'Albret, despite his age,

his common appearance, and his twelve children, sought her for himself; and the great "marrier" of richly dowered princesses, the Emperor Maximilian, to whom marriage had already given the rich provinces of Flanders, came in person to take the hand of the young princess, on whom his title made a great impression. France was threatened on all sides. But Maximilian, to hide the mysteries of his policy from the vulgar, went to Innsbruck while his ambassador in Brittany contracted the marriage by proxy. The King of France was more active and more fortunate. Anne of Beaujeu had worked skilfully on her brother's mind to make him desire this union with ardour. To mount on horseback, lance in hand, that he might conquer a rich province and a fair princess, was, to the young king, an imitation of the paladins, the heroes of romance whose deeds he was constantly studying. His troops already occupied a large part of the province; they undertook the siege of Rennes in the first days of August, 1491. At the beginning of October the king himself approached, coming to Baugé and then to Laval, and when the secret negotiations, which only became known from their result, reached their conclusion, he made a pilgrimage his excuse for proceeding to Notre Dame near Rennes. His devotions over, he entered the town with an escort of 100 men and fifty archers of his guard, he saluted the duchess and had a long conversation with her. Three days later they met in a chapel, where, in the presence of Orleans, Dunois, the Chancellor of Brittany, and others, they were affianced. The marriage took place in Touraine at the château of Langeais (December 6, 1491). The king was twenty-one, the duchess fourteen. They mutually ceded all their titles and claims to the duchy of Brittany, with the reservation, however, that if the duchess survived the king and had no children by him she would not proceed to another marriage save with the next king, if he could make the marriage; if not, with some near presumptive heir to the crown. This marriage was the last act of Anne of Beaujeu, *Madame la Grande*, as she was justly called. She had the rare merit of allowing power to pass gradually from her hands that it might go to those to whom it belonged without disturbance. After having ruled the kingdom vigorously for eight years, she returned simply and without effort to the duties of a wife and retired into privacy. She died in 1522. The marriage of Charles VIII. with the Duchess Anne brought under royal authority the last refuge of princely independence. Brittany was reduced to the position of Burgundy and Anjou; the last

and most obstinate of the independent provinces was included, like the rest, in the realm of France. The princes could no longer raise a banner against the king; the last war that they had waged was called by contemporaries "the Fools' War," and such attempts in the future were even more foolish.

Was the aristocracy vanquished for ever, finally curbed under the royal sceptre? Did this aristocratic reaction which appeared as soon as Louis XI. was dead have no result? What manner of persons surrounded Charles VIII.? They were the Duke of Orleans, Count Dunois; rebels, vanquished, captives set at liberty, restored to favour, honoured, and consulted. The aristocracy had been conquered and partially despoiled, but they had something left to them which attracted the crown, their spirit, their tastes, their aristocratic tendencies. The monarchy left the bourgeois and popular habits which it had affected more than once and which had served it so well under Philip IV., Charles V., Charles VII., and Louis XI. The crown took the sword and lance of the knights; it became warlike and conquering in imitation of the paladins of Charlemagne and the true chevaliers; even under Charles VIII. himself, it went to the conquest of the kingdom of Naples and dreamed of conquering Constantinople and Jerusalem.

NINTH PERIOD—THE ITALIAN WARS

(1494–1515)

CHAPTER XXXVII

THE FIRST ITALIAN WAR (1494–1498)

Italy in the Second Half of the Fifteenth Century.—At the time when the French monarchy absorbed the last of the great fiefs, the Italian peninsula still contained examples of every form of government; in the south, a monarchy; in the centre, a theocracy; and in the north, republics and principalities. In this land of a rich and corrupt civilisation, artistic marvels ill-concealed a premature decay, nor did literary brilliance hide moral decline. War was waged only by the arms of the *condottieri* who displayed skill in a form of tactics which involved many skirmishes and small slaughter, and who earned their pay with as little exertion as possible. Military virtue was extinct, a sign of a condition of affairs fatal to any people. To live well, it is needful to be able to die well, and Italy trembled at the sight of the sword. Honour was given to trickery, perfidy, deceit. Poison and the dagger decided all questions which in other days would have been decided by arms. Italian diplomacy was a school of crime.

The holy see and the states of the Church had fallen into the hands of Alexander VI., a Borgia, who dishonoured the chair of St. Peter by his abominable vices. At Naples Ferdinand earned the hatred of the nobles whom he robbed and of the masses whom he starved. At Florence Pietro di Medici did not know how to dissemble the authority which he exercised over the republic—an art in which his illustrious predecessors, Lorenzo and Cosimo, had been past-masters. In the duchy of Milan, Ludovico the Moor, brother of the late duke who had been murdered, devoted all his energy to finding a way in which he might usurp the power rightfully belonging to his nephew, Galeazzo Sforza, whose guardian he was, and he did not shrink even from the thought of crime. Venice, *la Dominante*, seemed to be at the zenith of her power; Genoa was in a state of perpetual revolution. The

glorious democracies of the previous century had been converted into oligarchies so narrow that in all the republics which existed in 1493 there were no more than 18,000 citizens enjoying political rights. From one end of the peninsula to the other despotism had taken the place of the former liberty and the peoples desired change without having the courage to effect their own salvation, to make themselves worthy of a better fate. Italy, fabulously wealthy and in a state of anarchy, was a prey ready for the first who dared to seize it. Charles VIII. proposed to be first in the field.

Unwise Concessions of Charles VIII. to Neighbouring States (1493).—Louis XI., who had given the Genoese to the devil, or, what came to the same thing, to the Duke of Milan, had carefully refrained from prosecuting the claims of the house of Anjou to the throne of Naples. Charles VIII. rescued those claims from oblivion that he might deliver some shrewd sword thrusts beyond the Alps. Anne of Beaujeu vainly offered counsels of prudence: "You will pay dearly by a long repentance." All the older politicians said the same, and Crèvecœur indicated that the Low Countries supplied the true direction for French expansion. "The greatness of the kingdom depends on the conquest of those lands." He was right, but the king refused to hear him; he desired something new, a brilliant and world-stirring expedition, after the manner of the paladins of Charlemagne, whose mythical exploits he persistently studied. He cared nothing for a war among the bogs of Flanders, where so many French kings had fought already. The red-hot ardour of the nobles, whose activities had been confined to their own land for thirty years and who wished to exert themselves abroad, carried all before it. Italy herself seemed ready to fall into the arms of France. Ludovico, threatened by the King of Naples, called in Charles VIII. Many others did likewise: the Marquis of Saluzzo, who wished his fief to depend on Dauphiné that he might be free from homage to his neighbour, the Duke of Savoy; the Neapolitan barons, exasperated against their king; Savonarola and the cardinals hostile to Alexander VI. "Noble spirits!" cried the poet Sannazar. "What madness led you, my beloved Italy, to pour out Latin blood for the sake of barbarians?"

As regards the situation of France, the time was not well suited for a distant expedition. The neighbouring powers, displeased at the acquisition of Brittany, formed a new league against France. Henry VII., the first of the Tudors, landed an English

army at Calais ; Maximilian, who had been so quickly supplanted by Charles, attacked Artois ; Ferdinand the Catholic, King of Spain, promised to cross the Pyrenees. These facts pointed to opportunities or necessities for war near home, but Charles, eager to set out, preferred to treat. By the Treaty of Étaples (November 3, 1492) the greedy Henry VII. re-embarked, carrying with him a promise of 745,000 gold crowns payable in fifteen years; by the Treaty of Narbonne (January 19, 1493) Ferdinand the Catholic received Roussillon and Cerdagne without repayment of the money originally lent and despite the protests of Perpignan which wished to remain French ; by the Treaty of Senlis (May 23, 1493) Maximilian regained Franche-Comté and Charolais, the conquests of Louis XI., for his son Artois. All these districts were French, essential for the defence of the realm. Charles cared nothing for this ; the submission of Italy was certain and the conquest of Italy was to be merely the prelude to greater achievements. From Naples he would pass to Greece, expel the Turks from Constantinople, and, like the great knights of the Middle Ages, regain the tomb of Jesus Christ and bring it under the rule of a Christian kingdom of Jerusalem. With such rashness was France plunged into those hazardous expeditions which prevented those internal reforms and gains of territory which offered at her very doors. For a worthy successor to Louis XI., France had to wait for Henry IV. and Richelieu.

Conquest and Loss of the Kingdom of Naples: Battle of Fornovo (1494–1495).—A fine army soon assembled (August, 1494) at the foot of the Alps, so eager were the French to enter that land of wonder which was to be their grave. Charles had 3600 lances, 6000 Breton archers, 6000 crossbowmen, 8000 Gascon infantry, 8000 Swiss pikemen ; in all, a force of 50,000 men, with 140 great cannon and a number of small pieces, " a gallant company, but ill-disciplined." Bayard served as a squire. Much that was needed for so great an undertaking was lacking ; no provisions had been prepared, no tents, no coined money. Heaven would provide. " The journey," says Comines, " was undertaken rather with an idea of going than of returning ; its leaders took no thought for the future."

The King of Naples had posted his brother with a fleet at Genoa and his son with an army in the Apennines, the former to prevent attack by sea, the latter attack by land. The Duke of Orleans gathered some ships at Marseilles and defeated the Neapolitans at Rapallo ; the Neapolitan army dared only await

the arrival of the French advance-guard under d'Aubigny. It was known that the Duke of Orleans had killed every one of his opponents at Rapallo; this was no *condottieri* war, in which the worst that could befall was to be unhorsed and put to ransom, but an *evil war*, without mercy, without quarter. Terror filled all Italy; the barbarian invasions were recalled, but now it was too late to send back the foreigner who had been summoned.

Charles VIII. crossed Monte Ginevra on September 2. He found himself in need of money at the very outset of the campaign. Having danced and played at ball with the Duchess of Savoy and the Marquis of Montferrat at Turin, he borrowed their diamonds in order to continue his march. At Genoa he borrowed 100,000 francs at 42 per cent. At Asti he was ill for some time and was joined by Ludovico the Moor; he then visited Galeazzo at Pavia, "where the duke was kept as a prisoner in his castle. But they spoke only of general matters as Charles was anxious not to offend Ludovico. The Moor, son of the great Francesco Sforza, was a very cunning man, but cowardly and deceitful when he was afraid and without faith if he saw his interest in breaking his word." At the moment he was in terror of the Neapolitans; he led the conqueror across the duchy of Milan to the frontier of Tuscany. Soon after this his nephew died and it was believed that Ludovico had purchased leave to poison him and take his place. The fortresses of Sarzano and Pietra Santa might have checked the French; Pietro di Medici opened them in the hope of being maintained in Florence, which a Dominican monk, Savonarola, had raised against him. Pietro was only the more quickly expelled by the people on his return; but the tribune monk, who regarded Charles VIII. as the scourge of God upon Italy, went to meet the young king and led him into the city. Charles entered Florence as a conqueror, his head high, his lance at rest, and wished to levy a contribution on the city. When his demand was refused he threatened. "Blow your trumpets," retorted Capponi, the standard-bearer, boldly, to end the attempted exactions of this conqueror who had not fought, "and we will ring our bells."

At Rome the cardinals and the barons, ill-treated by Alexander VI., opened the gates to the French as to liberators and urged the king to depose an incestuous and simoniacal pope. Alexander had taken refuge in the castle of St. Angelo. Charles trained his cannon on the fortress, secured Caesar Borgia, the pope's son, as a hostage for his father's good faith, and a Turkish prince, Djem

or Zizim, brother of the Sultan Bajazet, who might be useful in forwarding the ultimate plans of the French in the East. A few days later Caesar escaped, while Djem, who had been poisoned before he had been handed over, died.

Charles now approached the object of his expedition, the kingdom of Naples. The frontiers collapsed of themselves. Ferdinand I. died, and his son Alfonso abdicated in terror. His successor, Ferdinand II., had more courage and wished to fight ; at San Germano he found himself exposed to treason on two sides, in his army and in his capital, and was forced to fly to the Isle of Ischia, whence he reached Sicily. No further defence was offered. The servants of the army marked the houses their masters were to inhabit in Naples ; Charles VIII. and his men entered the city (February 22, 1495), while flowers were rained on them from the balconies. This enthusiasm, like all popular whims, was of short duration. " Never did king or nation meet with such love from any people," said the French. The report of this rapid conquest crossed the sea and the Greeks began to arm in expectation of the coming of their deliverer, " the great King of the Franks."

The victors, however, cared only to celebrate their easy conquest. Charles caused himself to be crowned King of Naples, Emperor of the East, and King of Jerusalem. He appeared before the people with a mantle of purple over his shoulder, a globe of gold in his hand, and " celebrated the occasion by tournaments and pastimes." His companions divided the fiefs between them and married wealthy heiresses at the expense of the nobles of the country. But two months later the future conqueror of Constantinople and Jerusalem received a letter from Philip de Comines, then his envoy to the Venetian republic. A formidable league of European sovereigns had been concluded against France with the aim of closing the retreat of Charles from Italy and reducing France to her original limits. Ferdinand the Catholic, Maximilian, and Henry VII. were the leaders of the league ; even the Italians who had called in the French or who had promised them fealty, such as Ludovico and Alexander and Venice, joined the alliance. The states of the peninsula gathered 40,000 men in the Po valley, while the other allies attacked the French frontiers. The Duke of Orleans was already hard pressed at Novara. The jealousy of Europe for France appeared for the first time, and there was need for haste. Charles left 4000 men with Gilbert de Montpensier, whom he named Regent of Naples, and with the rest took the road of the Apennines. He

had great difficulty in passing this chain through a narrow defile; the Swiss were loaded with cannon and even the nobles carried munitions of war. On the other side of the mountains, in the valley of the Taro, the confederate army, 30,000 strong, barred the route of the French, less than 10,000 in number. Charles none the less resolved to force a passage. While his advance-guard pushed along the Taro, he was attacked in the rear; he turned on the attacking force, and in an hour 3500 of them were killed, while the rest were dispersed. The Italians attributed the easy success of the French to the *furia francese* rather than to their own cowardice. The victory of Fornovo, however, merely served to open a way of retreat to the French (July 6, 1495).

Once in France, Charles seemed to forget Italy. Gilbert de Montpensier, Viceroy of Naples, a brave knight but one who never rose before midday, was not the man to supply in himself the help which he did not receive from others. Ferdinand II., arriving from Sicily with some Spanish troops, surprised Naples the day after the Battle of Fornovo and shut up Montpensier in Atella, where he died of plague. D'Aubigny brought back the remains of the French army; the dominion of France over Naples had fallen as rapidly as it had risen, amidst the same evidence of joy on the part of the people. No more traces remained of the expedition of Charles VIII. than of the deeds of Amadis de Gaul.

Death of Charles VIII. (1498).—Warned by experience and by the complaints of his people, the young king, says Comines, "turned his mind to living according to the commandments of God, to setting justice and the Church in good order, and so to arranging the finances that he should levy no more than 1,200,000 francs from the people as a *taille*, beyond his demesne revenues, on which he wished to live as the kings had anciently done. He was well able to do this, for the demesne was very great; including the *gabelles* and certain *aides*, it was over a million francs. He wished to confine a bishop to his see if he were not a cardinal and to allow no other plurality than these two offices; to keep the clergy to their benefices, but he would have found it hard to win the clergy to this. He held public audiences, where he received every one, to keep his people in fear and especially his officials." At the beginning of 1498 he was at the château of Amboise where he undertook great works, on which excellent workmen whom he had brought from Naples were employed. One day, passing along a dark passage, he hit his

forehead against a low door so violently that he died a few hours later (April 7, 1498). He was only twenty-eight. Comines says of him: "He was little learned, but so good that it was impossible to find a better creature." The direct line of the Valois became extinct with him, and was replaced by the branch of Valois-Orleans.

CHAPTER XXXVIII

LOUIS XII. (1498–1515)

Louis XII.—Charles VIII. leaving no son, the crown passed by right to the Duke of Orleans, then thirty-six years old, the grandson of a brother of Charles VI. Louis belonged to a delightful family, he was romantic and lively, pleasing both in his qualities and in his defects. His grandfather had been a brilliant knight; his father a poet who left some charming pieces; his uncle, Dunois, was one of the bravest captains of Charles VII. and one of the names of the old France which has remained in the mind of the people. Louis, without particular capacities, was distinguished by great good nature. He began his reign by reducing the *taille* and refusing the gift of the *joyous accession*, valued at 300,000 livres. Once the leader of the nobles against the crown, he bore no grudge against the faithful servants of Anne of Beaujeu, who had beaten him so thoroughly at St. Aubin. He received La Trémoille and the rest, telling them that it was not for the King of France to revenge the injuries of the Duke of Orleans.

He was at once concerned in an important affair. Anne, widow of Charles VIII., retired to the château of Nantes in her duchy of Brittany which by a second marriage she might bring to some foreigner. Louis, who had been married for twenty-two years to a daughter of Louis XI., for whom he had no love, demanded, despite the tears of this princess, that a divorce should be pronounced; Alexander VI. had need of the king and granted his request, and Louis at once married his predecessor's widow. Brittany was again united to France, this time for ever (1499).

It was a time for foreign conquest. The ease which had attended the first Italian expedition, and the stories of that fair land, revived the taste for distant adventure. Louis XII., heir of the rights of Charles VIII. in Naples, had further, through his grandmother, Valentina Visconti, pretensions to Milan which the Sforza had usurped. He gave way to the passion of his age,

but he did not act with the rashness of his predecessor. If it were necessary to return to Naples and to occupy the extreme end of the peninsula, he was wise enough first to seize some strong position in the north. Naples had been fatal to the French because it was too distant; Milan was of little value in itself, but its possession was indispensable if French armies were to operate in the centre or south.

Conquest of the Milanese (1499–1500).—Before attempting this conquest, Louis renewed the treaties which Charles had made with his neighbours and sought allies in Italy. The Duke of Savoy opened the Alps to him and undertook to follow him with his troops; Venice was promised Cremona and Ghiara d'Adda; Florence was to receive the submission of the rebel Pisa; the pope was gained; Caesar Borgia had already been gratified with the French duchy of Valentinois. Ludovico, the first traitor to the Italian cause, was isolated by his treason. Trivulzio, an Italian who had passed to the service of Louis XII., had merely to appear in the Milanese with 9000 horse and 13,000 foot soldiers. Ludovico, abandoned by all, fled to Tyrol, while the Gascon troops entering Milan broke his statue, the masterpiece of Leonardo da Vinci, to pieces (October 2, 1499).

Loss and Second Conquest of the Milanese (1500).—The faulty administration of Trivulzio, a former Guelf who persecuted his political opponents, afforded Ludovico an opportunity. He returned with a band of adventurers, Swiss or Germans, and surprised Milan (February 5). But a new French army crossed the Alps and met the force of Ludovico near Novara (April, 1500). The Swiss formed the main part of both armies; they preferred to sell their services a second time rather than cut each other's throats, and the victory rested with him who could pay best. Louis XII. was also the official ally of the Swiss, and promised the troops of Ludovico that they should not fight against a force in which the banners of the cantons were displayed. The duke attempted to fly disguised as a common soldier or a monk; he was handed over by a Swiss from the canton of Uri, sent to France, and after remaining shut up in the château of Loches for ten years, died at the moment of his release. His two sons reached Germany, whence they later returned. The Swiss, as they retired, seized Bellinzona, which commanded the valley of the Ticino and one of the routes to Italy. The lesson which Louis XII. had received was not lost; Cardinal George d'Amboise, who was employed to organise the conquest, treated the Milanese with leniency. He established a kind of parliament in

their capital, modelled on those of France, which gave the country impartial justice, a thing hitherto almost unknown to it, and he entrusted the government of the province to his nephew, the Lord of Chaumont, whose prudent and firm administration soon caused Milan to forget her former masters, who had so often treated her with a foolish cruelty.

Partition of the Kingdom of Naples (1500–1503).—The Milanese having been conquered Louis aimed at Naples, but instead of adopting the adventurous policy of his predecessor, he engaged in a kind of diplomatic campaign. He first assured himself of the neutrality or support of central Italy. The Florentines received help from him against Pisa, which was in a state of perpetual revolt, though the French troops long spared the heroic inhabitants of that city, who fought to the cry, "Vive la France." Alexander VI. wished to convert Romagna into a principality for his son, Caesar Borgia, but a thousand petty tyrants had converted that province into a nest of bandits. Some French troops assisted Caesar, a past-master in crimes and treason, to subdue the petty and bloody baronage of the Romagna. (Caesar was taken by Machiavelli for the hero of his book, *Il Principe*.)

France had thus become the dominating power in the centre and north of Italy. But Louis had wider aims. He hoped, in order to secure the kingdom of Naples without striking a blow, to divide it with Ferdinand the Catholic. By the Treaty of Grenada (1500) he reserved to himself the title of king, with the possession of Naples, Gaëta, the Abruzzi, and the Terra di Lavoro; Ferdinand asked only Apulia and Calabria with the title of duke. Louis overreached himself. All began well; the unhappy King of Naples, Frederic III., a popular prince, had confidently opened his fortresses to the Spanish general, Gonsalvo di Cordova, but when he asked help from Spain against the French, who were already on the frontier, he found that he had been betrayed (June, 1501). More angered against the traitor than against the enemy, Frederic handed over Naples and Château Neuf to the French, retiring to the Isle of Ischia. He afterwards surrendered to Louis XII., who gave him a pension of 30,000 livres and the county of Maine. He joined another captive Italian prince, Ludovico il Moro, on the banks of the Loire (1501), where he died three years later.

War in Naples between the Spaniards and the French (1502).—The conquest was completed, but the work of division did not proceed so amicably. The Spaniards and the French quarrelled

as to the tax of 200,000 ducats, payable on the herds which in the autumn passed from the heights of the Abruzzi into the Apulian plain. No mention had been made in the treaty of the Basilicata (Matera), the Capitanate (Foggia), or the farthest principality (Avellino), and each party claimed them. War began. The French viceroy, the Duke of Nemours, who was in force, speedily blockaded his opponent, Gonsalvo, in Barletta (1502). Ferdinand had recourse to one of his ordinary ruses. His son-in-law, Philip the Handsome, held the former Burgundian lands in the Low Countries, and in right of his wife, Joanna the Mad, was heir of Castille. He was then passing through France and was allowed to conclude the Treaty of Lyons by which hostilities were suspended and all was apparently settled; he was then disavowed by Ferdinand, who had reinforced Gonsalvo and ordered him to continue the war. Louis complained that he had been deceived for the second time. "He lies," retorted Ferdinand, "I have deceived him ten times." Nemours was unable to punish the treachery. Instead of concentrating his forces in order to take Barletta and make an end of the Spaniards there, he wasted time in skirmishes and engaged in fights which made the reputation of some knights but did not advance the king's interest. An example was the celebrated duel between Bayard and Sotomayor. The paladins of Ariosto fought no better. Meanwhile Spanish reinforcements arrived; Gonsalvo was relieved and Louis' best lieutenant, d'Aubigny, was defeated at Seminara and lost Calabria (April 21, 1503). Nemours, to repair this reverse, rashly attacked the enemy near Cerignola, where he was defeated and slain (April 28). Venosa and Gaëta alone remained to the French.

Loss of the Kingdom of Naples (1503).—Louis XII. made great preparations to take vengeance for this treachery. He sent two armies to the Pyrenees, but effected nothing, and a third across the Alps which fared no better. La Trémoille was in command; he was delayed for some time near Rome by the strange death of Alexander VI. and by the intrigues which accompanied the election of his successor. Gonsalvo had time to prepare his defence; posted on the Garigliano, he checked La Trémoille despite the exploits of Bayard; captured his artillery (December 27), and pushed into the suburbs of Gaëta, where La Trémoille was forced to surrender (January 1, 1504). Louis d'Ars, who commanded at Venosa, refused all capitulation, and with the remnants of his army forced his way heroically back to France.

Treaties of Blois (1504–1505).—There was reason to fear that the loss of Milan would follow that of Naples, as Maximilian already inclined to enforce imperial rights south of the Alps and Gonsalvo advanced northwards. Louis divided his enemies by three treaties which were signed on the same day at Blois (September 22, 1504). The first contained the embryo of the League of Cambrai since Louis and Maximilian agreed to attack Venice and divide the spoils. By the second treaty Louis promised the King of the Romans 200,000 francs in return for the investiture of Milan. By the third he renounced the kingdom of Naples on condition that it should pass to Charles of Austria, grandson of Maximilian, who was to marry Madame Claude, daughter of Louis XII., and to receive as her dower, in addition to all that Louis held or claimed in Italy, three French provinces, Burgundy, Brittany, and the county of Blois. No more disastrous convention could have been signed. This young Charles, to whom the daughter of the French king was promised, was heir to Philip the Handsome, his father, in the Low Countries; to his mother in Castille; to his paternal grandfather in Austria; and to his maternal grandfather in Aragon. He was assured of Italy; France was to be dismembered for him; he was to be granted the empire of Europe. Anne, who was rather Duchess of Brittany than Queen of France, was delighted and proud to secure so brilliant a marriage for her daughter, even at the expense of France, but France complained and Louis seized the first opportunity of returning to his duty.

Rupture of the Treaties of Blois.—Louis found his opportunity in 1505, when Ferdinand the Catholic, irritated against his son-in-law, attempted to disinherit him by contracting a second marriage. He married Germaine de Foix, niece of Louis XII., and the King of France, by another treaty, also signed at Blois (October, 1505), once more ceded his rights to Naples, this time to his niece, thus breaking one of the conditions for the marriage of Madame Claude. Brittany and Burgundy were still involved in the earlier treaties. Louis summoned the States-General at Tours that the arrangements might be openly rescinded (May 14, 1506). The States declared that the fundamental law of the monarchy did not permit the alienation of two provinces which formed part of the demesne of the crown. It prayed the king to marry his daughter Claude to his heir-presumptive, Francis, Duke of Angoulême, in order to secure the territorial integrity and independence of France. Louis made no difficulty in granting a request in accord with his own wishes and on this occasion he

possibly deceived the deceivers. Maximilian, always full of ambition and always in a state of penury; Ferdinand, charged after the death of Philip the Handsome with the regency and guardianship of his grandson, Charles of Austria, did not offer opposition. Louis XII. was even able in the following year, without being disturbed, to bring back to their duty those "proud villains," the Genoese, who were in revolt. "Tradesmen, merchants," cried Bayard, "defend yourselves with your awls and leave alone pikes and lances, to which you are not used." The merchant people made a brave resistance and the valiant La Palice was wounded. But the king had set vast forces on foot; Genoa was taken; her charter of liberty was burned by the hand of the common hangman; sixty of her bravest defenders were executed; and the seigniory of the town, with the islands of Corsica and Chios, were reunited to the royal demesne. The Genoese had further to pay a fine of 200,000 crowns and to construct at their own expense the fortress of the Lantern which was designed to keep them in order (1507).

League of Cambrai (1508).—The republic of Venice, allied sometimes with one, sometimes with the other party, was the only one of the Italian powers which had profited amid all the disasters of the peninsula. But her political astuteness could not succeed for ever; a time was bound to come when every one would turn against this power which gained at the expense of all. Not only were the Venetians envied for their wealth, their thousand ships and 30,000 sailors; all her neighbours had cause to complain of her. Louis XII. regretted the loss of Cremona, which he had recently ceded, and Crema, Brescia, and Bergamo, which had long since been lost to the duchy of Milan. Ferdinand the Catholic desired certain towns on the coast of the kingdom of Naples which he had pledged in return for sums which he had borrowed from the republic. Julius II. claimed Ravenna, Cervia, Faenza, and Rimini, old possessions of the holy see. Maximilian aspired to Verona, Vicenza, Padua, and Treviso in the name of the empire, and to Friuli and Trieste in the name of the house of Austria. All this jealousy and greed led to the alliance of the various powers in the League of Cambrai against the republic (December 10, 1508). The soul of the league was Pope Julius II., a fiery old man who wished to be "lord and master of the world game." He proposed to accomplish two objects: to restore the temporal power of the papacy and to expel the barbarians from Italy. But he seemed to find the barbarians useful in aiding him first of all to recover that

which he held to belong to the patrimony of St. Peter, and on April 27, 1509, he laid Venice under an interdict in which her magistrates, citizens, and supporters were included.

Victory of Agnadello (1509).—Louis XII. was the first of the allies to take the field, passing the Adda (April 15) at the head of more than 20,000 infantry and 2300 cavalry. The two *condottieri* in the service of Venice, Pitigliano and Alviano, acted independently, and on the ground that the senate had forbidden fighting, Pitigliano abandoned his colleague. Louis XII. met Alviano on the dyke of Agnadello (May 14, 1509). The Venetians at first held firm; the king who was in the first rank shouted in vain, "Children, your king watches you." The French could make no advance. Louis exposed himself to fire like any common soldier. "Let him who is afraid hide behind me; a true King of France never dies from a cannon ball," he cried. Finally, Bayard and some determined knights crossed the marsh and fell on the flank of the Venetians. The cavalry fled in panic while the infantry were annihilated, eight or ten thousand men being left on the battlefield with all the artillery and baggage. This victory left the road to the lagoons clear to the French; not a place resisted, such as attempted to do so being terribly dealt with. Louis, so good-natured in France, was cruel in Italy; he put every garrison to the sword which dared to hold out against him, and hanged all the peasants who cried "Viva San Marco." The republic saved itself by a stroke of wisdom which was also the result of profound calculation. She withdrew her troops from all the cities of the mainland and released her subjects from their allegiance. Those subjects felt obliged to remain loyal to masters who relied only on their devotion, while Venice, self-supporting and impregnable in the midst of the sea, waited for discord to arise among the allies. She had not long to wait.

The Holy League (1511).—Pope Julius II. had attained his first object; the towns of the Romagna fell again into his hands. He now aimed at his second object; he planned the expulsion of the barbarians and, without regard for his recent alliance, he determined to begin with the French, whom he had been foremost in summoning to the peninsula under Charles VIII., when he was merely Cardinal Julian de la Rovere, the mortal foe of Alexander VI. On February 2, 1510, he absolved the republic of Venice; he easily detached Ferdinand from the League of Cambrai, since that king had already gathered all the fruits which he desired. He undermined the never steadfast constancy of Maximilian and entered into intrigues with the Swiss (whose

subsidies Louis XII. had refused to increase) by the medium of the Cardinal of Sion, Matthew Schinner. The Duke of Ferrara, the ally of France, and the city of Genoa were attacked without success. But Louis XII. hesitated; this was no ordinary war. The queen, full of religious scruples, made a struggle with the head of Christendom a matter of conscience. The clergy of France met at Tours, and far from sharing the scruples of the king, granted from their goods a subsidy of 300,000 crowns, declaring any excommunications which the pope might launch against Louis and his kingdom null and void, asserting that in this purely political question the war was waged not by the pontiff but by the ruler of the Roman states.

The struggle was waged with little skill on either side. Chaumont, at the head of some French troops, resolutely surprised the papal army before Bologna, and Bayard only failed "by the space of a paternoster" from laying hands on the pontifical stole. Attacked as a prince, Julius II. defended himself as a soldier; he entered Mirandola through the breach (January 20, 1511) and would possibly have secured further successes but for a rising of the Bolognese who destroyed his statue, the work of Michael Angelo. Forced to retire, he was defeated at Casalecchio and returned ill to Rome. Louis XII. thought that the time had come to attack the pope himself. He called a general council at Pisa to examine the conduct of Julius and to depose him. This was a mistake, since it changed the character of the struggle. In place of a feeble temporal prince there appeared an all-powerful spiritual prince. Julius laid Pisa under an interdict, excommunicated the dissentient cardinals, assembled another council at St. John Lateran, and invoked the help of the Catholic powers of Europe. All answered his appeal, Ferdinand of Spain, Henry VIII. of England, Maximilian, the Venetian republic, and the Swiss, who were flattered with the title of *Defenders of the Holy See*. They formed a *Holy League* with the ostensible object of saving the Church from schism and with the real intention of driving the French across the Alps (October 5, 1511).

Victory and Death of Gaston de Foix (1511–1512).—The Spaniard, Ramon de Cardona, joined the pontifical army with 12,000 troops. The Venetians, thanks to the diversion, gradually recovered the places which they had lost; 10,000 Swiss, led by Matthew Schinner, descended from the mountains. Treason worked in the German troops and garrisons which were still in the service of Louis XII. in Italy, while the frontiers of France itself were threatened on the north, east, and south. A young

and heroic general, the king's nephew, Gaston de Foix, Duke of Nemours, overcame all the dangers in a moment. At the age of twenty-two he was placed in command of the army of Italy. With sword and money in hand he turned back the Swiss into their mountains (December, 1511). Bologna was pressed by the Spanish and papal troops; he threw himself on the town and raised the siege (February 7, 1512). The Germans had handed over Brescia to the Venetians; Gaston appeared suddenly under the walls, carried the place by storm (February 19), and gave it up for seven days to sack and pillage, 22,000 persons being killed. He only spared the house to which the wounded Bayard had been borne. Finally, in April Gaston appeared under the walls of Ravenna and placed himself boldly between the town and the camp of Cardona. After some vain attacks on the city, he turned against the enemy camp (April 11). His infantry were repulsed, but his artillery wrought havoc in the allied army and the French gendarmerie put the papal cavalry to flight. The Spanish infantry retreated steadily; Gaston grew angry, followed and charged with a few men; he defeated them, but fell with fifteen wounds on his face.

Loss of Italy.—It would have been far better for Louis XII. to have lost the battle and preserved this young and valiant general, "a great captain before he was a soldier," says Guicciardini. La Palice succeeded though he could not replace Gaston de Foix. Julius II. regained his courage and in the Lateran Council pronounced against Louis XII. a sentence reminiscent of the Middle Ages. The French army, abandoned by its German auxiliaries whom Maximilian had recalled, fell back before Cardona, allowed Bologna to be retaken, and found in their rear 20,000 Swiss. They had entered the duchy to restore Maximilian Sforza, the son of Ludovico, and to seize for themselves Locarno, one of the gates of Italy, while the Grisons, on the other side, were taking Chiavenna and the Valteline. La Palice, after a battle fought in the streets of Pavia, retired into Piedmont; many bodies of troops which could not rejoin him were massacred without pity. At Ravenna four French officers were buried alive, their heads left above the ground to prolong their agony. In the midst of these events Julius II. died (February 21, 1513). He had secured Parma and Piacenza and his dying eyes had seen the French in flight. He had succeeded in taking Italy from them, but he had given it to the Spaniards; it was merely a change of masters and not a change for the better. His successor, Leo X., continued his designs. He renewed at Malines the

Holy League, which the Venetians had abandoned to rejoin Louis, and the invasion of France itself was resolved upon.

Defeat of Novara and Battle of the Spurs: Invasion of France (1513).—Ferdinand, already master of Spanish Navarre, south of the Pyrenees, was waiting only for a favourable occasion to seize French Navarre, north of those mountains, and an English army was ready to land at Calais. Louis XII. faced the storm; though threatened even in his own kingdom he did not abandon Italy. La Trémoille and Trivulzio entered the peninsula with a fine army and with Maximilian Sforza blockaded the Swiss in Novara. But a relieving force, sent by the cantons, entered the town by night. In the morning the Swiss made a sortie with levelled pikes, advanced straight upon the French artillery, captured it despite the havoc in their ranks, and after a short though bloody battle routed the besieging army (June 6). Genoa profited by this disaster to recover her independence and Louis had no longer any possessions beyond the Alps.

It was many years since the provinces of France had seen hostile armies. Now the Swiss on the east and the English on the north invaded them. The Emperor Maximilian joined the latter, serving as a soldier at the rate of a hundred crowns a day. Near Guinegate a panic seized the French army. Bayard tried to check the enemy and was taken; the others fought only with their spurs, which gave their name to the battle (August 16). The Swiss, 20,000 in number, penetrated as far as Dijon, where they were checked by La Trémoille by means of much money and more promises (September 13). France's only ally, James IV. of Scotland, shared in her evil fortune, being defeated and killed at Flodden by the English (September 9).

Battles at Sea.—It is too often forgotten that the French navy does not only date from the time of Colbert. Gascon, Breton, and Norman sailors, long before the days of Jean Bart and Duguay-Trouin, had often put English corsairs to flight and attacked the English coasts. The merchant marine had also begun its history. Dieppe discovered the south-west coast of Africa, where her merchants traded long before the arrival of the Portuguese, and the men of Bayonne created their great whale fishery. After the beginning of the Italian wars the sailors of Provence and the galleys of Marseilles rendered important services to France, especially the brave and able Prégent de Bidoulx. In 1513 Prégent was called with his oared galleys from the Mediterranean to the ocean to oppose the English attacks on the French coast.

On April 25, he fell in with the English fleet, commanded by Admiral Edward Howard, and took shelter in the creek of Le Conquet near Brest; the admiral followed him and attacked him, boarding the flagship. Prégent had a single combat with the admiral, wounded him, threw him dead on the bridge of his ship, and sank the nearest vessel. Another ship, threatened with the same fate, fled, and the whole fleet withdrew. Prégent in his turn appeared on the coast of England and ravaged Sussex.

Some months later the fleet which had landed the army of Henry VIII. at Calais cruised down the Breton coasts and met (August 10) the French, who had only twenty ships, drawn from Brittany and Normandy, under the command of Hervé Primoguet. The English were two or three times superior in numbers, but the French had the advantage of the wind and attacked boldly. At the first encounter many of the English vessels were sunk. One French ship performed wonders, *La Belle Cordelière*, which Anne of Brittany had caused to be built at Morlaix and ornamented at great expense. Primoguet commanded her. Surrounded by twelve enemy ships, she had already dismasted some and forced others to retire, when from the top of one of the English ships a mass of artificial fire was thrown down which at once set everything ablaze. Some of the sailors and soldiers saved themselves in the boats, but Primoguet refused to leave the ship which the queen had entrusted to him. Yet his death cost the enemy dear. He steered straight for the English flagship, in which were many nobles, fastened himself to her by grappling irons, set her on fire, and perished with her. His heroic deed took place in view of Ushant.

Treaties of Peace.—But sea fights at this period had only a secondary importance. Questions were decided on land, and the triple invasion of France forced Louis to treat. By the Treaty of Dijon, France had already been freed from the Swiss. Louis disavowed the Council of Pisa to regain the pope and agreed to the Treaty of Orleans with the emperor and Ferdinand (March, 1514). Henry VIII. refused for some time to lay down his arms; the Treaty of London, which left him Tournai and assured him an annual pension of 100,000 crowns for ten years, restored peace between England and France. It was confirmed by the marriage of Louis XII. with Mary, sister of the English king. Thus, after fifteen years of war, after the loss of many men and much treasure, France was no further advanced across the Alps than at the death of Charles VIII.; the kingdom of

Naples and the Milanese, many times conquered by France, were still lost to her at this time.

New Policy. — Since the time of the crusades, the French had not fought external wars, but the acts of the reign of Louis XII. all occurred beyond the Alps in Italy. Louis XI. ended internal strife ; Charles VIII. began foreign wars. The monarchy having nothing left to conquer at home, sought to make conquests abroad. The same revolution which had occurred in France had also taken place in England, Spain, and Austria, with the result that all these princes, holding almost absolute authority, were free to look beyond their own frontiers. As soon as they saw France crossing her borders they united to compel her return. That isolation of states which was characteristic of the Middle Ages ceased ; henceforth, leagues and general wars became common, which involved more and more all the European peoples and brought their history into touch with that of France. Kings had two interests to pursue, to defend and add to their realms and to practise wise administration. Louis XII. fulfilled the first of these functions poorly ; for his fulfilment of the second there is little but praise.

Beneficent Administration of the Father of the People: Cardinal d'Amboise.—The accession of Louis XII. to the throne had added to the royal demesne the duchy of Orleans and the counties of Valois and Blois, his appanages. With the proceeds of his demesne he undertook to meet all his personal expenditure and the upkeep of his household, and was thus able to reduce the *taille* by almost a third, to 2,600,000 livres, or about 68,000,000 francs. The revenue was scrupulously employed for the payment of the army, the encouragement of industry, for agriculture, public works, and the improvement of the royal châteaux, the last being a work of public utility when directed by taste and art and serving to popularise both. Graces, pensions, ruinous fêtes were abolished. " I would rather," said Louis to his courtiers, " see men laugh at my avarice than see the people lament my extravagance." A tax had been established for the expedition against Genoa ; the campaign was short and less expensive than had been estimated. Louis returned the balance of the tax to the people, saying that the money would fructify better in their hands than in his. He freed the peasants from the rapacity of the soldiery ; those guilty of looting were executed, after which " no one was so bold as to take anything without paying, and the cocks crowed boldly in the fields without danger." Agriculture flourished, and commerce increased to

a degree hitherto unknown in France. "The third part of the kingdom," says a contemporary, "was put under cultivation in twelve years, and where one great merchant was formerly found at Paris, or Lyons, or Rouen, fifty could be found under Louis XII., and these thought no more of journeying to Rome, Naples, or London than their predecessors had thought of going to Lyons or Geneva." "The revenue of benefices, lands, and lordships," adds Claude Seyssel, "has everywhere increased, and I am told by those who are in chief charge of the finances of the realm, men of standing and authority, that the *taille* is now raised much more easily and with less force and expense than it ever was in the time of any previous king." Louis only summoned the States-General once, in 1506; even then, only the third estate was formally called. It was these States which, by the lips of one of the representatives of Paris, gave Louis the best title that any king can deserve, that of Father of the People, and the epithet was just, for, as St. Gelais says, "There was never such a prosperous time as under his reign."

Louis' name has always been united to that of his worthy adviser, George d'Amboise, who for twenty-seven years was less his minister than his friend. D'Amboise was born in 1460 of an illustrious family, who secured for him at the age of fourteen the bishopric of Montauban. Attached at an early age to the young Duke of Orleans, he shared his ill-fortune under the administration of Anne of Beaujeu. But the prince did not forget him when credit was restored to him, and he obtained the archbishopric of Narbonne, which in 1493 he exchanged for that of Rouen. Louis himself held the government of Normandy and left the chief power in the hands of the archbishop, whom he named his lieutenant, and who began there those useful reforms which after the death of Charles VIII. he extended over the whole kingdom. He loved the people as the king loved him, and was beloved in return. "Leave it to George," became a popular saying. Made cardinal, Governor of Milan, Legate of the Holy See in France, Amboise might have been pope after the death of Alexander VI. if the choice had rested with Louis and the French army. He had the greatest influence on the affairs of France and of Italy, and if, like his master, he erred much in his foreign policy, his administration had a character of probity and goodness which was not again found for long after his time. It must be remembered that as an all-powerful minister he did not oppose the first Treaty of Blois and that at

his death he left vast riches which would have been more in place in the hands of the poor.

Two New Parliaments.—The parliaments, exercising in the name of the king supreme justice over the provinces under their control, were the strongest instrument which the crown could have for bringing all privileged persons under the control of the law and the most independent spirits under the yoke of common obedience. Louis XI. had increased their number; Louis XII., from motives of equity, increased them still further, creating the two new parliaments of Provence (1501) and Normandy (1499). The Great Council, a species of Council of State, had been fixed to meet at one place by Charles VIII.

Compilation of Customary Law.—To facilitate the administration of justice, Charles VII. had projected the codifying and publication of provincial customs, the usages which constituted the law in each province, in order to free suitors from the arbitrary power of the judges. Charles VIII. published seven codes; twenty others were reduced to writing between 1505 and 1514, edited by experts with mature deliberation, and printed. This publication was the most important legislative work of the ancient regime until the great ordinances of Louis XIV., since it was no servile reproduction of ancient practices and was less an edition than a reform of the customary law, carried out in an anti-feudal spirit such as prevailed at the time among the lawyers and in the parliament.

Reforms in the Judicial Administration.—An ordinance of 1510 abolished the use of Latin in criminal cases, which were in future to be conducted in the common language of the land that witnesses might understand their depositions and the accused the charges brought against them. An edict of 1490 had already effected the same reform in the courts and in the acts of the civil power. The lawyers consumed the substance of the poor by the length and expense of cases; Louis attempted to reduce their extortions. The kingdom was divided into provostships and bailiwicks, and the bailiffs, nobles, and men of the sword united administrative, judicial, and military functions, which they performed inefficiently. Louis XII. forced them to graduate at the universities or to leave the administration of justice in the hands of deputies chosen from the ranks of the lawyers. The nobles were at the same time forced to place only learned men or licentiates on their tribunals and to assure them their salaries.

Venality of Offices.—One charge must be brought against Louis XII. He sold certain public offices in order to secure

resources without demanding new taxes. With some exceptions, however, he only sold financial posts, which was a very ancient practice. The venality of judicial posts, often appearing during the period prior to Louis XII., became officially established under Francis I. An ordinance of 1506 permitted private persons to use the postal relays established under Louis XI.

Beginning of the Renaissance in Letters and Art.—The Italian wars were fatal to those who made them and in their final phase were almost fatal to France. The forces of the state were turned from their real object and the right policy of France was abandoned to the private interests of the king. But the kingdom suffered no internal disturbance as a result of these wars and if no territory was gained, French civilisation entered actively by their means into the paths of the Renaissance. Since the thirteenth century France had passed through so many misfortunes that culture had been arrested. Art no longer showed the fine though severe grandeur of the age of St. Louis, and in the fifteenth century the flamboyant Gothic style reigned supreme; architectural lines, once so pure, were multiplied and twisted in a thousand directions. Architecture ceased to be either simple or great; in an effort to escape from the old style it became unnatural and no new style was found. The French language in Joinville, Froissart, and Charles of Orleans was naïf and graceful, but sustained force was wanting to the French writers, with the exception of Comines, because the great models of antiquity remained almost unknown to them. Italy, however, was rediscovering the treasure of the past. Aretino and Poggio in letters, Leonardo da Vinci and Brunelleschi in art, produced, after the date of Dante and Petrarch, after St. Francis of Assisi and the campanile of Florence, a renaissance which was entirely pagan and ancient. There was more translation and imitation than original work; poetic inspiration was cast in the mould of Horace and Virgil and the most eloquent aspired only to speak like Cicero.

The French entered Italy at the moment when this movement had reached the height of its vigour and they carried back over the mountains a taste for these new things. Antiquity found its zealous admirers in France. The savant, Gaguin, patronised by Louis XII., formed a precious library of ancient manuscripts. The Greeks Lascaris and Jerome Alexander found pupils in France who eclipsed their masters, men such as Vatable, Bude, who restored the study of Greek, and Danès, the master of Amyot.

The memory of the fair cities, the rich palaces, and all the elegance of Milan, Rome, and Florence inspired the idea of securing for French towns more air and better communications, while, as the royal provosts made thick walls useless, manor houses were built with a greater view to comfort. Architecture became less massive, admitting more air and light. The French artists themselves entered into these new paths, but the Italian masters had already realised the marvels of which the French dreamed. Some of these Italians crossed the mountains and hastened the artistic revolution by their coming. Charles VIII. caused Italian artists to work on the château of Amboise. Louis XII. made Fra Giocondo his royal architect and employed him to rebuild on solid foundations the bridge Notre-Dame, which fell for the fourth time in 1499. The same architect constructed the great chamber of the parliament which still exists and a chamber for the court of accounts which was burned in 1737, and was possibly responsible for the eastern façade of the château of Blois, the most original part of that curious monument.

Cardinal d'Amboise shared his master's tastes. He employed Roger Ango to begin the *Palais de Justice* at Rouen, which affords a beautiful example of the mingling of old and new, of Gothic architecture transformed by the Renaissance. The same artist executed important repairs to the cathedral of Rouen. But the chief work of George d'Amboise was the château of Gaillon, which he designed as the residence of the Archbishops of Rouen, and where the Renaissance triumphantly threw down all traces of the older manors, levelled the old tower with the ground, replaced the pointed arch by the round arch, and produced the medallion statuettes and that rich and smiling ornamentation which appears on every side in place of the grimacing and weird figures of Gothic art. The church of St. Maclou at Rouen, the chapel of the Hôtel de Cluny at Paris and the Hôtel la Trémoille, now destroyed, the Hôtels de Ville of Compiègne, Arras, St. Quentin, and Nevers all date from the reign of Louis XII.

Death of Louis XII. (1515).—The peace which Louis XII. established after the dangers of 1514 would certainly have made his reign more fertile in beneficent institutions and masterpieces. But he did not long survive it. Anne of Brittany died on January 9, 1514; Louis mourned his Breton girl, as he called her, and did nothing but weep for eight days. On August 7 in the same year he married a sister of Henry VIII., Mary of England,

a young girl of sixteen, who forced him to change his simple and regular life. For some months there were only feasts and tourneys. Louis had been accustomed to dine at eight ; he now had to dine at midday. He had gone to bed at six ; now he often remained up till midnight. He had always been in feeble health since a serious illness in 1504, and this mode of life killed him. He died on January 1, 1515, at the age of fifty-three, sincerely mourned by his subjects.

TENTH PERIOD — FIRST STRUGGLE OF FRANCE WITH THE HOUSE OF AUSTRIA: GROWING POWER OF THE CROWN: THE RENAISSANCE

(1515–1559)

CHAPTER XXXIX

FRANCIS I. (1515–1547)

France at the Beginning of the Sixteenth Century.—With the sixteenth century a new era in the history of France begins. During the preceding four hundred years her kings had been engaged on the task which the Carolingians had already once accomplished, of consolidating the state and reviving central authority, of rescuing France and her monarchy from the power of the nobles. The English hindered the accomplishment of this arduous work for a hundred years; they were at last finally expelled, and in most directions the royal demesne was extended to the natural frontiers of the country. With the exception of Calais, on the North Sea, no dominion save that of the king was known on the shores of the Channel and the Atlantic; no other gate was open to foreign intrusion. The whole southern frontier of the Pyrenees was French, with the exception of Roussillon, which had been so foolishly given up by Charles VIII. France held Marseilles on the Mediterranean, on the shores of which she afterwards established the port of Toulon. She was bounded by the Alps as far as Savoy. But on the north and north-east her frontier was ill-defined. By the retrocession of Franche-Comté she had lost the barrier of the Jura; by that of Artois she had exposed Paris to attack. On this side it was very difficult to protect the capital from the enemy and for a considerable period no attempt was made to repair this weakness. The mistaken policy of Charles VIII. directed his forces towards Italy, where they perished without result, forces which should have been employed on the northern and eastern frontiers.

But in spite of the defective character of the frontier of

France, one important result had been achieved. France already extended from the Channel to the Mediterranean, from the Pyrenees to the Meuse, forming a great country, lying between Spain, England, Germany, and Italy, capable of holding the balance between them. She was thus open to the various influences of these lands and able to extend her own influence over them in turn, to the great profit of the common civilisation of Europe.

In the internal organisation of the state the kings had already made considerable progress in the task of establishing centralisation and unity. The communes, petty and jealous republics, had been compelled to resign their local privileges; the feudal lords had lost their independence. Moreover, the serfs had in great measure been enfranchised, with the result that the exaltation of one class and the repression of others had brought all into closer touch and formed them into a great people. Divergencies still existed, but from the time of Joan of Arc unity was more apparent than diversity; all displayed the same spirit in relations with foreign lands. Once there had been peasants, lords, fiefs; now there was a people, a king—France.

Proof of this growing nationality is afforded by the development and spread of the French language, which by an edict of Louis XII., renewed and amplified by Francis I., was introduced into public acts, in which it replaced Latin, and which was used equally by Montaigne from Gascony, Rabelais from Touraine, and by Amyot, who was born at Melun in the Ile de France.

To enable French society to free itself from the civil institutions of the Middle Ages, as it had already been delivered from the political institutions of feudalism, was the work accomplished by monarchical power during the period which begins with the Renaissance. Externally, France, after having checked the further development of the overgrown power of the house of Austria, was gradually extended to the limits of ancient Gaul and was able to compel Europe itself to accept her hegemony. The French language, thanks to the great writers of the eighteenth century, became the medium of diplomacy throughout the continent; a knowledge of it was a necessity to the *élite* of European society, as it was the model for polite intercourse. French literature dominated the mind of the world, and even in times of disaster and defeat France was consoled for the loss of an empire which her arms could no longer maintain by the softer and more effective influence which she owed to her genius,

to her arts, her letters, and her science. France became the second fatherland of the world; her history has been studied, her language learned in every country.

The king with whose reign this new era began embodied the age of transition in which he lived. In some of his faults he recalled the period which had closed; in some of his qualities he represented that which was beginning.

Francis I. (1515–1547).—Louis XII. was succeeded by Francis I., a descendant of that Duke of Orleans who had been murdered in 1407. The "Father of the People" was replaced by a "gentlemen's king." The new sovereign was handsome, strong, brave, and accomplished. He was as reckless of his life in battle as he was of the property of his subjects in the fêtes which constantly took place at his court. Though imperious he was easily led; he was a patron of arts and letters and was himself an author. Both his vices and his virtues were carried to excess. Louis XII., witnessing his folly and youthful exuberance, had declared, "That great baby will ruin everything." But he was mistaken. With the pride of power, Francis I. appreciated the grandeur of the French nation. By his courage, and upon occasion by his prudence, a quality more difficult for him to exercise, he frequently repaired the errors into which he had been led by his favourites. If he acquired no new territory he at least preserved France intact, and he did so at a critical time and in face of the greatest enemy with which she had yet been called upon to contend. He increased taxation and spent lavishly, but he reformed the administration of justice and greatly assisted the progress of literature and art. His vices and faults were concealed under a certain brilliancy; they were atoned for by his chivalrous generosity and by his royal splendour. Francis I. does not rank among the best of the Kings of France; he has his place among the most remarkable.

Francis had often been filled with indignation at the complaisance which Louis XII. had shown towards the parliament and the clergy, and he had early resolved that, when he should be master of the situation, he would give a very different and more vigorous tone to the administration. Duprat, a shrewd though unscrupulous man, was made chancellor and was charged with the duty of putting into practice these new maxims of government.

The king's impatience led him to revolt against the treaties which his predecessor had concluded. Of these, one was only a truce for a year; he did not renew it and prepared to cross the

Alps, having given the constable's sword to the Duke of Bourbon, an impetuous character capable of great deeds but unsuited to fulfil the rôle of a subject. He entrusted the regency to his mother, Louise of Savoy, a vain, covetous, and malignant woman, with many faults and only one good quality, her love for her son.

Marignano (1515) : Bayard.—A formidable army was assembled at Lyons and in Dauphiné. It consisted of 18,000 infantry, drawn mainly from Gascony ; 20,000 German foot soldiers ; seventy great cannon and three hundred smaller pieces, directed by the grand master of Genouillac, a worthy successor to Jean Bureau. Among the commanders were included the Constable Bourbon, Marshals la Palice, Lautrec, d'Aubigny, and Trivulzio, the Dukes of Châtellerault, Vendôme, Alençon, Lorraine, Gueldres, Albany, and a great engineer, Pedro Navarro. But there was a mere lieutenant of an artillery company who outshone all these nobles, Bayard, the knight " sans peur et sans reproche," who " was worth an army in himself."

Venice at war with the Spaniards, and Genoa threatened by the Duke of Milan, summoned Francis to enter Italy. Charles of Austria, the young ruler of the Low Countries, had entered into negotiations with him despite his two grandfathers, the Emperor Maximilian and the King of Aragon. But these two last princes, Pope Leo X., and the Duke of Milan had renewed their alliance, and 20,000 Swiss in their pay guarded the passes of Mont Cenis and Mont Genèvre, the only two routes by which it was supposed to be possible for a French army to descend into the plain of Piedmont. As these two routes united at Susa, the Swiss had established a camp of 10,000 men there.

Francis began his campaign by a master-stroke. Chamois hunters and shepherds from the Alps of Dauphiné acted as guides to Trivulzio, Lautrec, and Navarro ; it was discovered that at the cost of great exertions it was possible to ascend the valley of Bracelonnette and to descend into that of the Stura, passing over the Col d'Argentière, which was held to be impracticable. It was necessary to bridge abysses and to blast rocks in order to open a passage for the artillery. The army occupied three days in scaling the Alps ; it reached the crest of the great chain on the evening of the third ; on the fourth it reached Argentière and the sources of the Stura ; and on the fifth it descended into the plain of Saluzzo (August 15). A force of cavalry under La Palice, d'Aubigny, and Bayard crossed the Col d'Agnello, on the south side of Monte Viso, higher up by another chamois track, and surprised Prosper Colonna, the general of the

papal troops, at table in Villafranca. He was taken with seven hundred of his knights. The left of the enemy's positions was thus turned. The Swiss were surprised, and fell back upon Milan in order to effect a junction with the Spanish army which watched the Venetians. The French followed them to Marignano, and as the pay which the allies had promised them had not arrived, they entered into negotiations with the king. Francis offered them 700,000 gold crowns and a pension to Sforza, Duke of Milan, who was with them. The war seemed about to end without a battle when 20,000 more Swiss descended from the Alps. Matthew Schinner, Cardinal of Sion, a bitter enemy of France, reproached the others with having abandoned the holy see. The stipulated sums were already on their way to the Swiss, and they resolved to effect a double blow, to capture the convoy and to surprise the French army.

On September 13 "the bull of Uri and the cow of Unterwalden," two great trumpets which had in the past sounded at Granson and Morat, caused their notes to re-echo through the streets of Milan. The Swiss issued from the town by a long and narrow causeway between two marshes, and advanced with lowered pikes upon the French artillery which they hoped to capture. But the pick of the men-at-arms were there, men and horses alike clothed in steel. Thirty charges were delivered upon this "crowd of peasants" without checking its advance; effective artillery fire mowed down whole columns, but the main body still moved forward unshaken. Three times the Swiss carried the first batteries, around which a "battle of giants" raged. The constable, princes, and lords were as reckless of their lives as "maddened boars"; the king himself charged at the head of his personal guards and was struck many times. Night came, but the battle continued by moonlight, until complete darkness fell. The French and Swiss armies were mingled with each other and so remained waiting for the morning. The king slept on a gun-carriage a few paces from the enemy; Bayard strayed into the midst of the Swiss and was obliged to crawl on his hands and knees in order to regain his own men without being discovered. At daybreak the battle was renewed, but between nine and ten in the morning the Swiss heard shouts of "Marco! Marco!" behind them raised by the advance-guard of the Venetian army which was hastening up to take part in the battle. "The conquerors of princes" formed in good order and recrossed their mountains without opposition.

The Battle of Marignano was a brilliant opening for the reign

of Francis, and the joy of the French army was extreme. The young king determined to do honour to the hero of the Brescia and of Guinegate, and caused Bayard to knight him on the field of battle. The chevalier carried out all the rites of the ancient ceremony, and having given the accolade to the king, sprang up, kissing his sword and crying, "Truly, my good sword, from this day you will be a cherished relic, since you have now given the order of knighthood to so virtuous and powerful a king, and I will bear you no more save against Turks and Saracens and Moors."

Perpetual Peace with the Swiss (1516).—Italy lay at the mercy of Francis I.; he used his victory with moderation. Without attempting the conquest of Naples, he employed himself in securing the strong places in the north of the peninsula. The Doge of Genoa surrendered that city to him, and he himself laid siege to the citadel of Milan, which Navarro promised he should enter within a month. Maximilian Sforza did not wait to be driven from his castle; he resigned his duchy in exchange for an annual pension. The emperor was obliged to cede Verona to Venice; the King of England consented to sell Tournai, St. Amand, and Mortagne back to France. Finally, a satisfactory peace closed Italy to the Swiss, and in the following year the confederacy, renewing the treaty which they had made with Louis XI. in 1474, undertook, in return for an annual subsidy of 700,000 crowns, to permit the king to levy troops among the cantons whenever he had need. This treaty, the so-called "Perpetual Peace," lasted as long as the French monarchy.

Concordat with Leo X. (1516).—The pope, head of the league and of the house of Medici, arrived at Bologna to hear the terms of the conqueror. He anticipated that he would be obliged to make great sacrifices in Italy, but Francis preferred to increase his power in his own kingdom. He granted to the Medici the possession of Florence and sacrified to the pope the Pragmatic Sanction of Charles VII. But he replaced that treaty by a concordat which placed the clergy of France under his control. Leo X. retained the right of appeal to Rome in greater cases, with the proviso that the judges commissioned by him should be Frenchmen. He abandoned the right of reservation and of expectant graces, by means of which the holy see had secured the nomination to a number of benefices; he recognised the right of the king to dispose personally of ecclesiastical dignities, preserving only the privilege of refusing spiritual investiture in event of the nominee being guilty of some canonical offence.

Francis repudiated the doctrine of the fathers of Basle as to the superiority of general councils over the papacy and re-established the tax of *annates*, by which all clergy promoted to an important benefice were compelled to pay a year's revenue to the holy see. Both parties thus disposed of that which did not belong to them according to the common law of the realm; in the division of the spoils of the Gallican Church, says Mézeray (with some exaggeration of the terms of the concordat), the pope took the temporal *annates*, and the king the spiritual nomination to bishoprics. The clergy, the universities, and the law courts protested against the abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction, which impaired the prerogatives both of corporations and of individuals, and the parliament of Paris refused to register the concordat. But it was difficult to resist a young and victorious prince successfully. "They shall see," cried Francis, "that in France there is a king and not a Venetian oligarchy." After resisting for two years, the parliament, "by express command of the king," registered the concordat, and its only consolation was that, in practice, it remained faithful to the spirit which had inspired the national council of Bourges. The concordat consecrated an important increase of royal power, for it placed the clergy in dependence on the king, as the nobles had been since the time of Louis XI., as the bourgeoisie had always been.

The Court of Francis I.—During his stay in Italy, Francis I. was impressed by the wonderful results of the Renaissance, and he determined to introduce the new art into France as his most valuable conquest. He persuaded many great Italian artists to follow him across the mountains and bought from others their chief masterpieces. The consideration which the youthful conqueror displayed for the intellectual leaders of mankind had more weight with them that the gold he gave them. The story that Leonardo da Vinci died in his arms is unhappily false, but it is true that the king called the artist his father, that he accorded royal honours to a painting of Raphael, that he delighted in all things intellectual, and that the sage, the poet, and the artist, whom he treated as men useful to the state, never found themselves out of place in that brilliant court which surrounded him.

The court of France, which has exerted upon public morals, upon literature, upon the national spirit, and even upon foreign nations so enduring and too often so pernicious an influence, dates from Francis I. Before his time it did not exist. The sober councillors who surrounded Louis XII. and Anne of Brittany permitted only restrained and infrequent fêtes. Francis I. liked

always to be followed by so numerous a court that it was computed there were rarely less than six thousand and sometimes more than eighteen thousand horses around the royal residence. The nobles came there only to practise the art of obedience under the eye of their master. Francis laid down that a court without ladies was a year without spring time, a summer without roses, and by the reputation of his fêtes he drew thither those noble ladies who had hitherto remained hidden in the recesses of their feudal manors. "At first," as Mézeray justly remarks, "this had most excellent results, since the fair sex introduced polite and courteous manners into the court, and instilled generosity of a high standard into well-trained minds. But manners were soon corrupted. Offices and rewards were distributed according to the caprice of women, and the ladies of the court caused the adoption of most pernicious maxims of government." Three women especially exercised a disastrous influence on the court during the reign of Francis; his own mother, Louise of Savoy, the Countess of Châteaubriant, sister of Lautrec, and the Duchess of Étampes, who, that she might injure the dauphin with his father, revealed state secrets to the enemies of France.

Treaty of Noyon with Charles of Austria (1516).—Until 1519 France and Europe remained at peace. In 1516 Ferdinand the Catholic died, and his death gave Aragon, Navarre, Naples, Sicily, and Sardinia to Charles of Austria, who was already sovereign of the Low Countries and of Castille. Francis made no attempt to prevent his accession to this magnificent inheritance. He signed with him the Treaty of Noyon (1516), which concluded an offensive and defensive alliance between the two princes, securing no other advantage for France than the restoration of Navarre to Jeanne d'Albret, of which she had been deprived by Ferdinand the Catholic. A second death, that of Maximilian, changed the whole situation (1519).

Francis I. becomes a Candidate for the Imperial Crown: Election and Power of Charles V. (1519).—In the death of Maximilian, Francis saw a vista of new grandeur; he aspired to revive the empire of Charlemagne and believed that he had only to demand the imperial crown in order to secure it. Germany needed an able prince to defend her against the Turks, whose power then resembled some raging flood, threatening alternately the shores of Europe and those of Asia. It might seem that no one was better able to arrest this torrent than the young victor of Marignano. But the German princes realised the position to which the Kings of France had reduced their nobles and they

feared a like fate. The Archbishop of Mainz declared aloud at the time of the election, "Every one to-day trembles at the least sign of a king." It appeared that there was nothing to be feared from the young King of Spain, a ruler without glory, whose lands were extensive but scattered, and who, as master of Austria, would be obliged to receive the first onslaught of the Turks if they turned against Germany. Henry VIII. of England was also among the candidates. His island kingdom was far away; his candidature was hardly serious. "Pounds sterling," says a contemporary, "are no better than gold crowns marked with a sun" (the standard French money). All the candidates had liberally distributed gold among the electors—the bills of receipt still exist—but though Francis gave most, Charles of Austria was elected and became the Emperor Charles V. Two centuries of warfare resulted from this simoniacal election.

Francis I. had written in a most chivalrous spirit to Charles V. before the election; he declared that they both wooed the same mistress and would remain good friends whichever might prove to be the fortunate aspirant. His defeat weighed upon him. Not only was his ambition wounded, but he saw the dangers which threatened France and Europe from the union of so many crowns on one head. From this moment, the policy of France changed. It was no longer directed to win a province beyond the Alps, to acquire some useless appanage for a cadet of the royal house; it aimed at saving the menaced liberty of the continent. Master of Spain and Naples, of the Low Countries and Austria, Charles V. might be said to hold Europe by the four corners. He was in addition emperor, a position which carried with it the suzerainty of Italy; he soon formed an alliance with the pope and with Henry VIII. of England, while Fernando Cortes and Pizarro conquered Mexico and Peru for him. One obstacle alone stood in the path of the new Charlemagne, whose motto was "Ever farther!" that obstacle was France, threatened by him already on three sides—by the Pyrenees, by Franche-Comté, and by Flanders; France who would not consent to submit to him or to be subdued.

It is the glory of Francis I. that he accepted this apparently unequal struggle with the house of Austria. He relied upon his courage and renown; he believed that a strong and obedient state, a compact kingdom, a martial people, wealthy and devoted, would enable him to prevail against a high-sounding list of divided and disaffected states, against this empire "upon which the sun never sets," "this great vessel, of which the

bow was in the Atlantic Ocean and the stern in the Indian Sea."

Negotiations with England (1520).—The two rivals contended for the alliance of Henry VIII., King of England, the only sovereign of importance besides themselves. Francis offered him splendid fêtes, the Field of the Cloth of Gold, between Guines and Ardres (June, 1520). There he wasted his treasure in pompous frivolity and forced his courtiers to ruin themselves with him. "Many lords," says Martin du Bellay, "bore thither on their shoulders their mills, their forests, and their parks." A building of the period, the Hôtel du Bourg-Théroude at Rouen, still displays to us in curious bas-reliefs the stately cavalcades and the various incidents of this famous interview. Francis surpassed his guest in magnificence, in his address, and in the rare elegance of his conduct and manners. He offended the self-esteem of the English king in place of winning him over. Charles V. was more adroit; he sought out Henry VIII. at Gravelines and, himself shabbily dressed like a suitor, saluted him as his father, pensioned his favourite minister Cardinal Wolsey, to whom he promised the papal tiara, and thus secured for himself the English alliance.

French Invasion of Navarre: Imperialist Invasion of Champagne (1521).—Defeated in diplomacy, Francis hoped to be more fortunate in war. A revolt began in Spain; he ordered the invasion of Navarre, which Charles V., despite his promises, had not restored to Henry d'Albret, by an army which was ostensibly only in the pay of that prince (1521). Lesparre was in command; he captured Pampeluna, where a young Basque noble, Ignatius Loyola, was wounded; he was led by his wounds to renounce the profession of arms and he afterwards founded the order of the Jesuits. At the same time Robert de la Marck, Duke of Bouillon, with the secret support of France, declared war upon the emperor and attacked Luxemburg. But the Spanish rebels were crushed before the arrival of the French, who were then easily expelled from Navarre. In the north, the Count of Nassau, general of Charles V., overran the duchy of Bouillon, invaded Champagne, took Mouzon, and advanced upon Mézières. It was proposed to burn that town to prevent it from being left to the enemy. "It is not a weak place," cried Bayard, "for men of courage are found there," and he threw himself into the town. The imperialists summoned him to surrender. "I need a bridge by which to march out," he answered, "and your bodies have not yet filled the ditch." In two days the

enemy fired five thousand bullets into the town, and at this siege bombs and mortars such as have been employed in modern times were used for the first time. A thousand terrified soldiers fled. "So much the better," said Bayard, "such *canaille* ought not to share our glory." After three weeks the enemy abandoned his efforts. Bayard had saved France from an invasion which no army was available to check.

Battle of La Bicocca: Loss of Milan (1522).—The invasion of Champagne was immediately followed by open war between France and the emperor. The first important blow was struck in Italy. Lautrec, who commanded in the province of Milan, had offended the inhabitants by his harsh and rapacious government. As his forces were inferior to the Spanish troops of Pescara, he abandoned Parma, Piacenza, and Milan itself (1521). He had difficulty in keeping the Swiss with him, because he was unable to pay them. For though Francis had promised him 400,000 crowns for this purpose, the Duchess of Angoulême, jealous of the Countess of Chateaubriant, Lautrec's sister and the king's mistress, had induced the intendant Samblancay to hand over the money to her. The Swiss, weary of waiting for their pay, demanded money, dismissal, or battle; Lautrec led them to the attack at the Bicocca, seven miles from Milan (April 22). They made a resolute advance along a narrow road in order to carry the position, and delivered three attacks; decimated by artillery fire, they fell back and retired into their mountains. As a result of their retreat, Milan was abandoned to the Spanish troops, and Lautrec on his return complained bitterly because he had not received the promised money. The superintendent, from whom the queen had secured a receipt for the sum, could not justify his conduct, and five years later he was hanged.

Treason of Bourbon (1523).—Francis fancied that he would restore affairs by his personal intervention. He directed 25,000 men towards the Alps, but at the moment when he was about to take command, a plot was revealed of which the success would have ruined France. Charles V., assured of the support of the new pope, his former tutor, Adrian VI., and of that of the King of England, who had promised to effect a landing in Picardy, had secured a powerful ally in the very heart of France. Master of La Marche, Bourbonnais, Auvergne, Forez, and Beaujolais, the Constable Bourbon occupied the position of a prince. An able general, proud and adventurous in disposition, devoured by ambition, and with his eyes already on the throne, he was irritated by the petty intrigues and discontented with

the extent of feminine influence in the court of France. Louise of Savoy had designed to marry him and to share in his vast inheritance; sustaining a repulse, she became his implacable enemy and schemed with the Chancellor Duprat to overthrow a will by which the constable held half his possessions. Bourbon lost the case. Charles V. had carefully watched the progress of the affair; he now offered Bourbon, over and above all that he already held, Dauphiné, Provence, and Lyonnais, which were to be erected into a kingdom, as the price of his desertion of Francis. Henry VIII. at the same time urged his claim to the western provinces, while the emperor demanded Burgundy and the Somme towns. A plan for the dismemberment of France was thus formed. A papal bull released the French from their oath of fealty. The last representative of mediaeval feudalism, Bourbon thought that he could act as the former Dukes of Brittany and Burgundy had done; he forgot that there was now a France which was resolved to remain one and that treason towards the king was treason towards her.

Francis visited him in his castle of Moulins, hoping to secure from him an avowal of his intended treason, repentance, an oath of friendship, and subsequent devotion, but Bourbon remained cold and unmoved. No sooner had Francis left him than he fled along a circuitous route and took refuge in Germany.

Triple Invasion of France (1523).—As the constable might have left accomplices behind him, the king was unwilling to leave the kingdom, the less so as a triple invasion, designed to assist Bourbon and the districts which he had promised to raise in revolt, now took place. Francis sent Lautrec into Guienne against 25,000 Spaniards who vainly attacked Bayonne; Count Claude of Guise was despatched against 12,000 German landsknechts who had entered France on the side of Franche-Comté and Champagne and who were driven back over the Meuse; and finally, the aged La Trémoille was sent against 35,000 English or Flemings, who advanced within eleven leagues of Paris, but whom he checked and then compelled to retreat by his able manœuvres, despite the fact that he had a mere handful of soldiers.

Death of Bayard (1524).—Fortunate in France because he had chosen his lieutenants well, the king suffered disaster in Italy. He had sent his best army there, 40,000 strong, under Admiral Bonnivet, an accomplished and brilliant courtier, a brave man, but an inferior general. In place of advancing at once upon Milan, which was undefended, and taking it, Bonni-

vet gave the enemy time to fortify it and allowed Lannoy, Viceroy of Naples, and Bourbon to effect a junction. He fell back along the Biagrasso upon Ticinella, left Bayard unsupported at Rebecco, and being compelled to retreat still farther in order to preserve his communications with France, he retired to the line of the Sesia, being wounded at Romagnano during his passage of this river. Bayard, whom he had left to protect the rear-guard, received a musket shot in the stomach. As the French retreated towards the Alps, Bourbon recognised the chevalier lying at the foot of a tree, his face toward the enemy, and expressed to him his grief at seeing him in such a state. "I have no need of pity," answered Bayard, "for I die as a brave man; but I pity you, since you are serving against your prince, your country, and your oath." Posterity has agreed with Bayard.

First Invasion of Provence (1524).—This defeat and the death of Bayard left the French frontier exposed to attack, and Bourbon, eager to stifle his remorse by winning some great success, crossed it. All Provence lay open to him, except Marseilles, which he found to be well fortified. He felt assured that three cannon shot would suffice to astonish the good burghers to such an extent that they would come with halters round their necks to the feet of the emperor. But Marseilles received him vigorously; the very women laboured to strengthen the wall, and the counter-mines on the side which was attacked were known as the "ladies' trench." Bourbon allowed forty days for this siege, but in his rear and on his right flank the furious peasants took up arms and hastily descended from the mountains to capture his convoys and cut off stragglers. Francis approached in person with 8000 cavalry, 34,000 infantry, and a strong force of artillery. He succeeded in closing one end of the *cul-de-sac* into which Bourbon had advanced, and the imperialist army, becoming demoralised, retreated towards the Alps (August, 1524).

Battle of Pavia (1525).—The King of France found himself in a position to appear once more upon the scene of his earliest exploits, and he was unable to resist this temptation. No enemy opposed him. At Rome the wits posted a notice offering a reward for the discovery of an imperialist army lost in the Alps. Francis captured Milan without striking a blow, and considered himself able with impunity to detach a force of 10,000 men for the conquest of the kingdom of Naples, while he himself pressed the siege of Pavia.

This imprudent action, which the king had refrained from

committing after his victory at Marignano, led to a serious disaster. Bourbon, animated by hatred, discovered unexpected resources; he turned everything into money and went to Germany. At the end of a few weeks he returned with 12,000 landsknechts. He formed a junction with Pescara and Lannoy, Viceroy of Naples, and the three together moved upon Pavia, placing Francis between them and the city, the garrison of which amounted to 6000 men, commanded by the resolute Antonio de Leyva. The position was critical; the older generals, Tavannes, Lautrec, and La Trémoille, advised the raising of the siege and the selection of another field of battle. Bonnivet asserted that the king must not retreat before a traitor, and Francis found this reason sufficient to induce him to hold his ground. In this battle (February 24, 1525), the French artillery accomplished marvels: "Genouillac tore gap after gap in the enemy's ranks; arms and heads flew about." But when the enemy began to waver under this murderous fire, the king fancied that the day was won; he threw himself upon them at the head of his men-at-arms and thus masked his artillery, rendering it useless. The Spanish infantry profited by this mistake; they fell upon the Swiss, who took to flight when they saw Antonio de Leyva advancing from the fortress against their rear, and the French men-at-arms found themselves alone on the field of battle. La Palice, La Trémoille, and all the best generals fell round the king. Bonnivet, the author of the disaster, had an opportunity to escape, but he remained to be killed. The king, himself wounded and surrounded by corpses, fought on for a long time. He refused to surrender to the traitor Bourbon. A French gentleman, Pompéran, recognising him, drew him from the mêlée and conducted him to the Viceroy of Naples, who received his sword on bended knee. "I hope," said Francis, "that I shall be treated as a king," and demanded that he should be sent to Madrid to his cousin the emperor. That evening he wrote to his mother a long letter, in which he said, "I would have you know my misfortune, for of all my belongings I have nothing left except my honour and my life which is safe." France turned this passage into a briefer and more heroic message, "All is lost save honour."

Regency of Louise of Savoy: Alliance with England.—France was not lost though her king was a prisoner. After the Battle of Poitiers and the capture of King John, she had experienced incalculable evils, but then the enemy were in the heart of the country and national unity had hardly been born. The defeat

of Pavia had been sustained on the banks of the Po; Italy alone suffered, pillaged as it was by the mercenaries who had gained the battle. The frontiers of France were not even attacked. Louise of Savoy, as regent, displayed a commendable and wise activity. She spent money freely in order to ransom prisoners and to reconstitute the body of men-at-arms. At the same time as she formed an army, she guarded against internal disorders, and abroad she entered into secret negotiations with Venice, the pope, and even with the Turkish sultan, Suleiman. The last she endeavoured to hurl against Austria, while she purchased the alliance of Henry VIII., who, alarmed at the growth of Charles V.'s power, caused a remarkable clause to be inserted in the treaty which he made, to the effect that the regent should not consent to the cession of any province. Henry realised that the integrity of France was the guarantee of the independence of Europe; he further did not desire any diminution of that which he was pleased to call his inheritance, for he still bore the title of King of France (August 30, 1525).

Captivity of the King: Treaty of Madrid (1526).—When Francis reached Madrid, he did not find Charles V. as magnanimous as he had expected. The emperor had affected to prohibit all celebration of the victory, on the ground that "no one should find cause for rejoicing in the misfortune of a king." But he none the less kept Francis captive and for long refused to see him. Sick with disappointment, scarcely consoled by the presence of his sister, Francis thought of abdicating in favour of his son, and of thus leaving in the hands of his rival only a brave knight in place of a King of France. But his resolution failed him. He consented to sign a disastrous treaty (January, 1526), after having entered a secret protest against the moral violence which, in his opinion, served to annul all the acts of a prisoner. He ceded Burgundy to Charles, but reserved the homage of that province; renounced his claims to Naples, Milan, Genoa, and the suzerainty of Flanders and Artois; restored the property of Bourbon, and promised to marry the emperor's sister, the queen-dowager of Portugal. Exchanged for his two sons on the banks of the Bidassoa, he spurred his horse on to French soil, crying, "I am again a king." An assembly of notables decided that the king was not capable of ceding the most important province of the kingdom. The deputies of the estates of Burgundy invoked the coronation oath, and declared that they would remain French despite king and emperor. Charles saw his plan frustrated; he accused Francis

of disloyalty ; the king retorted that the emperor "lied in his throat," and suggested the settlement of the dispute by single combat.

The Holy League (1526): The Sack of Rome (1527).—Francis, still dumbfounded by the disaster of Pavia, did not renew the war with vigour. He carried on many negotiations, ratified all the acts of the regent, confirmed the treaties which she had concluded, continued the secret relations with the Porte, and signed with Pope Clement VII. (who released him from the oath which he had taken at Madrid), with the King of England, with Venice, Florence, and the Swiss a Holy League for the deliverance of Italy. That unhappy land, which had been the scene of war for thirty-two years, was at that time the prey of mercenary bands, which the generals obeyed rather than commanded. The Italians made an attempt to free themselves from these ferocious foreigners ; an Italian army was assembled under the command of the Duke of Urbino. But the Constable Bourbon descended from the Alps at the head of a new force of ten or fifteen thousand fanatical and booty-loving Lutherans. One of them, George Frondsberg, wore round his neck a chain of gold with which, he said, he hoped to strangle the pope. In place of checking the advance of this new terror, the Duke of Urbino followed cautiously at a distance, concealing his trepidation by comparing himself to Fabius Cunctator. Charles V., who was not unwilling to read Italy a lesson, left Bourbon without orders. The constable was no longer master of his men. When they had devastated the Milanese, the mercenaries demanded some new prey, Florence or Rome, preferably the latter, "the sacrilegious Babylon." Bourbon gave way to them, forming great designs in his mind, and perhaps aspiring to the kingdom of Italy. But he was the first to fall in the assault on the walls of Rome. His soldiers, who were devoted to him, avenged him cruelly, and for nine months Rome suffered tortures and outrages such as neither the Goths nor the Vandals had ever inflicted upon her. It was the army of Charles V. which profaned the capital of Christendom and held the pope prisoner in the castle of St. Angelo. It is true that the emperor, in order to conceal the part which he had in this great scandal, caused masses to be said for the deliverance of the Holy Father, but the brigands only ceased to pillage after they had been decimated by plague.

Second War with Charles V. (1527–1529): Expedition of Lautrec to Naples (1528).—The King of France accused Charles

V. as the author of those horrors from which he profited while condemning them. Francis might well have reproached himself since he had broken his word to his allies. While the imperialists were sacking Rome, he assembled a meeting of notables at Paris, the only one which he called, and having brought many charges against his rival, secured two million gold crowns for the ransom of his sons. Meanwhile he despatched Lautrec into Lombardy, with orders to penetrate to the extremity of the peninsula and to effect the conquest of the kingdom of Naples, of which the possession was so valueless to France. Lautrec at first gained some brilliant successes, and secured almost the whole kingdom. But he was left without money; he offended Doria, the Genoese admiral, who deserted him; pestilence followed, carried off the general and discouraged the army; the expedition was ruined. This was the fourth French army which Italy had devoured since the Battle of La Bicocca. Another, under St. Pol, was destroyed in the spring of the following year at Landriano in Lombardy. The peninsula remained in the power of Charles V., and for nearly three and a half centuries it suffered from the influence of the house of Austria.

Treaty of Cambrai (1529).—It appeared probable that Charles V. would succeed in subduing France. But a war of religion was on the point of breaking out in Germany; Suleiman, the secret ally of Francis I., led his formidable janissaries to the walls of Vienna, and the King of England threatened to abandon the Austrian alliance by repudiating his first wife, Catherine of Aragon, the aunt of Charles. The emperor, finding that two fresh wars were about to ensue upon his triumphs of Pavia and Landriano, wished to secure the peace of the west while he was occupied so fully in the east and north. Louise of Savoy and Charles's aunt, Margaret of Austria, met in the town of Cambrai and there concluded the "Peace of Dames." Charles, who kept Naples and was about to be crowned King of Lombardy, renounced his claim to the province of Burgundy, but maintained all the other terms of the Treaty of Madrid: a ransom of two million gold crowns, the cession of Hesdin, Tournai, the suzerainty of Flanders and Artois, and the abandonment of all French claims to Italy.

Six Years' Peace (1529–1535): Alliance with the Turks and with the German Protestants.—The suspension of hostilities effected by the Treaty of Cambrai lasted until the end of 1535. Charles and Francis profited from this, but in different ways. Having regulated as its master the affairs of Italy, and having

protected Vienna and Germany against the Turks, the emperor took the offensive against them. He gathered in the ports of Spain and Italy five hundred ships, manned by 30,000 men, and led them against Tunis, a pirate stronghold then ruled by a man of genius, Haireddin Barbarossa, Suleiman's admiral. The fort of Goletta was taken ; Barbarossa was put to flight ; 20,000 Christian captives were freed ; and Tunis was restored to its former ruler who recognised the suzerainty of Charles V. (1535).

Francis I. abandoned himself to the extravagant enjoyment of peace, though without neglecting entirely the counsels of prudence. That he might no longer be at the mercy of Swiss and German mercenaries, he organised a national infantry, which amounted to 42,000 men. He renewed his alliance with Henry VIII., who was on the point of breaking finally with the holy see (1532), and at the same time he recovered the favour of the pope by seeking for the young prince, afterwards Henry II., the hand of Catherine de Medici, the pontiff's niece. Clement VII. died soon afterwards, but papal policy continued to tend towards alliance with France since the house of Austria held Naples. Francis further revived the old connection with Scotland, whose king married first Francis' eldest daughter and then Marie of Lorraine. He later signed the first treaties between France and Denmark (1541) and Sweden (1542). He thus attempted to establish beyond the frontiers of France a coalition of secondary states, in order to hold in check the aspirant to universal dominion. In 1534, he ceased to attempt to conceal his relations with the Porte, remarking that when wolves fell upon his flock, it was necessary to call in the help of dogs. He demanded the friendship of Suleiman by an embassy which was received with great honour at Constantinople. The sultan promised to assist his friend, "the padishah of France," with all his power, in case of need, and a commercial convention concluded between the two monarchs was in reality an offensive and defensive alliance. The German Protestants, who had formed the League of Schmalkalde against the emperor, also received overtures from Francis (1532). But these two alliances placed him in a difficult position ; the "most Christian king" could not ally with the Turks without great scandal, and yet the alliance was necessary to him. The "eldest son of the Church" could not give the hand of fellowship to the reformers who were tearing the Church to pieces, and yet it was important for him to have friends within the empire and to increase the embarrassments of his mighty rival in his own lands.

Francis did not hesitate to abandon religious in favour of political interests; such abandonment was inevitable since national interests were born with the centralised modern states.

The Reformation.—The Reformation and the consequent schism in the Church resulted from that irresistible movement which in the sixteenth century led the human mind to break through those barriers by which its activity had hitherto been circumscribed. The revival of classical learning opened new fields for thought. While Christopher Columbus and Vasco da Gama discovered new worlds and opened new spheres for the exercise of man's physical energy, Copernicus discovered the true laws of the universe and presented them for the speculation of mankind. It is no matter for surprise that an age which saw such great achievements of human daring and of the human intellect, should fall under the dominion of the mighty power of thought. Amazed at all these novelties, the world began to doubt all things old. A spirit of curiosity and criticism ranged everywhere; it transformed the arts, literature, and social conditions. It aspired to transform also the institutions of religion, which, on the evidence of the last of the Fathers of the Church, groaned under a weight of abuses. During the fifteenth century the Councils of Constance and Basle had in vain attempted to correct the discipline and manners of the clergy; in vain Cardinal Julian had said to Eugenius IV., "I see the axe laid to the root, the tree bent, and instead of supporting it while it is yet possible, we hurl it to the ground." The Church had refused to reform herself, but before eighty years had passed a revolution had torn half of Europe from her.

It was at the end of the year 1517 that Luther began his struggle with Rome; in 1520, the rupture was complete. In 1525 the Elector of Saxony, the Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, the Dukes of Mecklenburg, Pomerania, and Zell, and a large number of imperial cities had accepted the ideas of the reformer, and, a momentous event, the grand master of the Teutonic Order had secularised Prussia, one of the greatest domains of the Church, and declared himself an hereditary duke.

Beginning of the Reformation in France.—The new ideas spread early to France, where they made their first conquests among the literary class. All the great French lawyers of this period accepted the Reformation either secretly or avowedly. A party in the court itself inclined towards it. Louise of Savoy appeared to be hardly opposed to it; her beautiful and accomplished daughter, Margaret, Queen of Navarre, the author of

"mysteries" and "novels," openly professed the principles of the German reformers, and the Duchess of Étampes, the king's mistress, piqued herself on protecting them. Lefebvre of Étaples, Louis Berquin, savants known and esteemed by Francis, wrote theses in support of them. The former put forward Protestant ideas six years before Luther. Finally, the court poet, Clement Marot, abandoned his elegies and epigrams in order to translate the psalms of David, which the Parisian reformers chanted at *Le Pré aux Clercs*. Francis, far from being alarmed by these manifestations, tried to attach to himself Erasmus of Rotterdam, the king of erudition and of literature in this period, who was accused of having prepared the way for Luther by his attacks on the monks. But when the German peasants, drawing social theories from the new doctrines, attempted the overthrow of all authority, Francis considered that the Reformation, which had been a revolt against the papacy, might easily become, in politics, a revolt against royal authority. Although he continued from self-interest to be the friend of the German Protestants, he was unwilling that their ideas should take root in his own territories.

First Persecutions of the Protestants.—During the captivity of the king, two Lutherans had been burned in the capital. Francis had stopped these executions, but in 1528 a statue of the Virgin was mutilated in Paris. Francis declared that "if he found one of his members infected by this doctrine he would cut it off for fear that the rest of his body might become corrupt," and from that day he caused the reformers to be persecuted. Berquin, who refused to recant, was burned on the Place Maubert (1529); at Vienne, Seez, Toulouse there were other executions. The necessity for keeping on good terms with the German Protestants modified the persecutions, but in 1536 six wretches were cruelly executed in different parts of Paris in the presence of the whole court.

Third War between Francis and Charles V. (1536–1538).—Peace was interrupted by a crime on the part of the emperor. Francis had a secret agent at Milan; at the instance of Charles V. this agent was taken and put to death in a dungeon by Duke Francesco Sforza (1533). The duke died shortly afterwards, leaving no heir; Francis at once renewed his pretensions to Milan, and at the beginning of 1536 he invaded Savoy and Piedmont, the dominions of the "porter of the Alps," who since 1494 had opened those mountains to the French, but who now, as the brother-in-law of Charles V., wished to keep them closed.

The emperor returned at this moment from his glorious expedition to Tunis. At the news of this aggression, he abandoned all restraint and at Rome, in full consistory, before the cardinals and the ambassadors of Christendom, he accused Francis of turbulent ambition and impiety, on the ground of his alliance with the unbelievers; he swore that he would make him the poorest gentleman in his kingdom. "If I have no more resources than the King of France," he added, "I will go with hands bound and a halter round my neck and throw myself at the feet of my adversary to implore his pardon."

Second Invasion of Provence (1536).—The invasion which Charles then attempted in Provence was no more successful than the earlier effort, though he had already commissioned the historian Paul Jovius to write the account of his victories. "How many days' journey is it to Paris?" said the emperor to a French captain who had valiantly defended Fossano. "If your majesty," was the answer, "means by days of battle, it would be at least twelve, unless the aggressor's head were broken in the first engagement." It did not require even one of the days of which the brave captain had spoken to check the 50,000 men of Charles V. The Constable Montmorency, reviving a tactical plan of the days of barbarism, destroyed the villages and open towns, granaries, mills, and supplies of food. He created a desert in front of the imperial army and entrenched himself in a strong position before Avignon. The enemy advanced in sight of Aix and Marseilles, but found themselves enclosed between these two places (both of which were strongly guarded), the sea, the Durance, and the Alps, in a wasted country, in the midst of a hostile population, who intercepted convoys and cut off stragglers. Decimated by hunger and dysentery the imperialists retreated, and the emperor "buried in Spain his honour which had died in France." This expedition gave the second but not the final proof that France is impregnable on this side.

The Provençals had behaved admirably; the people of Picardy did equally well against the Count of Nassau. At St. Riquier and Peronne, women fought on the ramparts side by side with men. It was not at first proposed to defend Peronne, but d'Estourmel, a brave gentleman of the suburbs, threw himself into it, bringing with him his wife, children, servants, and all the provisions in his granaries, and so revived the courage of the inhabitants that the imperialists were forced to retreat. The Normans did not see the enemy in their midst, but they went

to seek him, and their corsairs took prizes to the value of 200,000 crowns of gold from the Spaniards.

Truce of Nice (1538).—The two adversaries, after having once more engaged in close combat, found that each was invulnerable on his own ground. Charles had been checked in France; Francis met with no success either in the Low Countries or in Italy. The pope, alarmed at the progress of the Turks, who were sacking the coast of Otranto, intervened and caused the Truce of Nice to be signed, which was to last for ten years. Francis preserved Hesdin, Savoy, and Piedmont, and his position was thus better than it had been after the Treaty of Cambrai (1538).

Charles V. in France (1539).—For a moment it appeared possible that from irreconcilable enemies, the two sovereigns would become devoted friends. They had an interview at Aigues-Mortes, where in their confidential discussions they addressed one another by the titles of cousin and brother. Some time afterwards, the city of Ghent, weary of the weight of taxation, rebelled against Charles V. and offered to hand itself over to his rival. Francis, not content with making this proposal known to his new friend, persuaded him to pass through France in order to be able to crush the rebels the sooner. The emperor accepted the invitation, was magnificently received and fêted in the midst of that France which he had wished to dismember. Francis went to meet him as far as Chatellerault; he hoped to conquer his politic friend by his generosity and to secure Milan by his favour. Allusions and requests were not spared. One day one of the king's young sons sprang on the back of the emperor's horse, crying, "Sire, you are my prisoner." In the midst of a dinner, which the Duchess of Étampes adorned, Francis suddenly remarked to the emperor, "You see this fair lady? Well, she urges me to keep you in ward." "If the advice is good," replied Charles, "follow it." But that evening he took care not to receive back at the fair hands of the duchess a bag which he had allowed to fall as if by accident. He reached Flanders without his journey having cost him anything except vague promises. The king had counted on receiving the investiture of Milan for one of his sons, and was profoundly irritated at having been deceived by the emperor. An act of treachery of which Charles was guilty, the assassination of two French agents at the Porte, caused the renewal of war (1541).

Fourth War between Francis and Charles (1542–1544).—On this occasion the efforts of Francis and Suleiman were better concerted. The Turkish janissaries conquered almost the whole

of Hungary, while Francis overran Luxemburg and Piedmont with his armies. Some months earlier Charles had led a formidable armament against Algiers (October and November, 1541), but his fleet, attacked by a furious tempest, was almost entirely destroyed. The sea was freed; the *fleurs-de-lis* and the crescent came together in the Mediterranean, and a Franco-Turkish squadron bombarded Nice, the only town left to the Duke of Savoy (1543).

Charles V. complained loudly of this treason to the Christian cause. "All my life," he would exclaim, "has been spent in soothing the discord in the Church and in saving Christendom from the Turks; all the life of the King of France has been spent in supporting the arms of infidels and in perpetuating the troubles of the Church." To make an end of such opposition, he concluded a peace with the German Protestants and allied with the King of England. A new invasion of France from three sides was at once planned (1543). Del Guasto, Governor of Milan, at the head of the Spaniards, was to defeat the force of the Duke d'Enghien and invade Provence; in the north, the emperor and Henry VIII. were to meet under the walls of Paris, the former advancing through Champagne, the latter through Picardy. Francis, since Pavia, had distrusted the issue of great battles and preferred to wear out his enemies; this was the order given on all his frontiers. But Montluc was sent by Enghien, who was face to face with the Spaniards at Cérisoles, to ask leave to fight. Francis refused, but was persuaded by the confident assertions of Montluc. At the news that he was to give battle, more than a hundred young gentlemen of the first families hastened to Piedmont, bringing with them their courage and their money, which Enghien borrowed to pay his soldiers. The men-at-arms made several brilliant charges, but victory would not have been won without the old bands of French and Swiss infantry. The Spaniards lost 12,000 men, all their cannon, and their baggage; Enghien remained master of Piedmont, but was unable to advance since part of his army was recalled to defend the north of France from invasion (April, 1544).

Siege of St. Dizier: Peace of Crespy (1544): Treaty with Henry VIII. (1546).—On this side the campaign began disastrously. Charles entered Champagne without opposition; he took St. Dizier, which was ill fortified and in bad repair, yet held out for forty days. He also took Epernay and Chateau-Thierry, where he was checked by Claude of Guise at the foot of walls hardly completed. The Duchess of Étampes was accused

of having revealed to him the whole plan of defence. The dauphin was defeated at Meaux; the Parisians in terror began to emigrate with their movable goods to Orleans. "God," cried Francis, "thou hast made me pay dearly for this crown which I supposed that I had received as a gift at thy hands." Fortunately for France, the King of England failed to observe the plan which had been arranged. He halted at the siege of Boulogne and Montreuil, leaving his ally isolated with a mercenary army without money or provisions after the adventurous dash which he had made across Champagne. The dauphin was already harassing the rear of the imperial army, and at the moment when Charles V. fancied that he had reduced his foe to the last extremity, he was obliged to sign the Peace of Crespy (September). The two monarchs mutually restored their recent conquests; Francis remained master of Savoy and Piedmont, and secured Milan for his younger son. But the prince died, and the emperor hastened to invest his own son Philip with the duchy. Henry VIII. declined to adhere to this peace, and only consented to treat when a French fleet menaced the English coast. He retained Boulogne, but promised to return it in eight years on receipt of two million crowns. It was restored in 1550 for four hundred thousand crowns.

Massacre of the Vaudois (1545).—Francis was growing feeble. He was no longer the brilliant knight of Marignano or Pavia, the friend of Leonardo da Vinci and Erasmus. Prematurely aged by his excesses, he was at fifty a morose old man. The darkest blemish of his reign belongs to these unhappy years. While he was at war with Charles V., Francis conciliated the reformers, and the Edict of Coucy, in 1535, had even ordered the suspension of religious persecution. When peace had been concluded harsh and severe men, such as Montmorency and Cardinal Tournon, resumed the ascendancy in the council. After the Treaty of Crespy, they attributed the defeat of the king and his very illness to the relaxation of rigour against the Protestants. He allowed himself to be persuaded and resumed the persecution. At Meaux, forty fires were lit on one day (1546); but the most odious execution was that of a whole inoffensive people, the Vaudois, whose beliefs dated from three centuries back.

In 1540 they were condemned as heretics. A delay of execution was granted to the two little towns of Merindol and Cabrières and to some thirty villages of the Alps of Provence in favour of peaceable peasants who paid their taxes regularly and exhibited pure and simple manners. But in April, 1545, stern

and definite orders reached the parliament of Aix from the court. Baron de la Garde, assisted by President Oppedo and Guerin, the advocate-general, suddenly entered the land of these unhappy men with their soldiers; three thousand were massacred or burned in their houses; six hundred and sixty were sent to the galleys; and the remainder were dispersed in the woods and mountains where the majority died of hunger and misery. Not a house or tree remained in a circumference of fifteen leagues.

Death of the King (1547).—Francis I., though he may not have known all the details, approved what was done and ordered the persecution to continue. Foreign affairs were no better. This was the period during which Charles V., freed from the war with France and assured of peace with the Turks, turned his forces against German Protestants and, under the cloak of destroying heresy, attempted to destroy German liberty. The Battle of Mühlberg appeared to place the empire at his feet. Francis did not live to see this great success of his rival; he had died three weeks before, at the château of Rambouillet, at the age of fifty-two (March, 1547).

He was, in his good and his bad points alike, a remarkable king. He was characterised by those brilliant defects for which France has always had too much leniency. His gallantry bordered on debauchery, his magnificence on profusion, his courage on rashness. He was violent, capricious, the prey of unworthy favourites; on occasion he was even unjust and perfidious, and he was always arbitrary in his conduct. But he sometimes showed a real greatness, as when, before the massacre of the Vaudois, he pardoned the rebel Rochelais, "not wishing," as he said, "to have, like the emperor, the blood of his subjects on his hands." He loved intellectual things; he had artistic tastes, and, despite his despotism and his faults, his name will always be honourably associated with a great era in modern civilisation.

Foundation of Havre de Grace and Vitry-le-Français (1517, 1545).—Two French towns, Le Havre and Vitry-le-Français, date from the reign of Francis I. France had only two small ports at the mouth of the Seine, Honfleur on the left bank, Harfleur on the right. The latter began to disappear under the sands, and Francis, who aspired to have a great naval establishment on the Channel, ordered a better site to be found in the neighbourhood. Some short distance away a village, inhabited by fishermen, was found, consisting only of a large dyke in the

midst of a marsh and a small chapel dedicated to Notre-Dame de la Grace. But the place faced the open sea, beyond the mouth of the Seine, out of reach of those moving sands which modern skill alone has been able to overcome. It possessed also an advantage unique in the ports of this coast: high tide lasted for three hours in the outer port, while in the very neighbourhood it began to fall as soon as it had ceased to rise. Two towers had defended the place in the time of Charles VII., and Louis XI. had begun the construction of a wooden quay. In 1517, Chillon, vice-admiral of France, laid the first stone of that new city, the situation of which was so well chosen and which became the chief French commercial port on the Atlantic. It was named Franciscopolis, but this Greco-Latin name was too learned for the poor fishermen, who, faithful to their patroness, continued to call their town Le Havre de Grace. But the memory of Francis I. remains there, the round tower which defends the entrance to the port bearing his name.

When Charles V. invaded Champagne in 1544, he took and razed Vitry in Perthois. Francis I., instead of restoring this small town, which was dominated by the neighbouring heights and incapable of defence, forced the inhabitants to settle some distance away in a fertile plain on the banks of the Marne. The new city became Vitry-le-Français, or Le François, but less fortunate than Le Havre, it never attained any importance and has no monument of interest, except its cathedral, which affords an example rather of the Perpendicular than of the Renaissance style of architecture.

CHAPTER XL

HENRY II. (1547–1559)

Accession of Henry II.: Ascendancy of Montmorency and the Guises.—Henry II. exaggerated his father's faults and possessed none of his good qualities. He had neither spirit nor grace; his build was heavy, his intellect dull. He took pleasure only in physical exercise, and this he loved so well that he died while engaged in it. Despite her forty-eight years, Diana of Poitiers, by her wit and by a beauty which defied the ravages of time, exercised an influence over him which her amazed contemporaries attributed to an enchanted ring. He created her Duchess of Valentinois and allowed her to rule the court, in which the queen

lived without credit. The chief administration was placed in the hands of the Constable Montmorency, of Marshal St. André, the king's favourite, and of the family of the Guises, a younger branch of the ducal house of Lorraine, poor in goods, but rich in ambition. For the present they only declared themselves to be the heirs of the house of Anjou; later, they posed as the descendants of Charlemagne. The reign opened with a great distribution of offices, honours, and pensions. In three weeks the king dissipated 400,000 crowns which he had found in his father's coffers, collected for the war against Charles V. "The only gates to credit were those of Montmorency and Guise," says a contemporary. "Everything went to their nephews and clients; marshals' batons, governments of provinces, companies of men-at-arms, nothing escaped them . . . any more than flies escape the swallows; estates, dignities, bishoprics, abbeys, offices, and every other rich morsel they incontinently devoured, and for this purpose they kept in every part of the realm apostate and servile men to inform them if any holder of a salaried position or of a benefice should happen to die."

The new reign began by severities which supplied a tardy reparation for the worst deed of Francis I. A capital charge was laid against the murderers of the Vaudois, and thanks to various influences they were taken. One of them, Advocate-General Guerin, was hanged. The Sire de Vervins, who had surrendered Boulogne to the English in 1544 against the will of the inhabitants, was decapitated.

Revolt in Guienne (1548).—A bloody revolt raged in Guienne. Bands of from ten to fifteen thousand peasants rose against the salt tax, ranged over the province, murdered the *gabeleurs* (the collectors of the gabelle), defeated the men-at-arms sent against them, released prisoners, and burned the houses of the officers of justice. At Bordeaux, the governor's lieutenant was assassinated. Montmorency arrived with 10,000 men; he determined to force an entrance, though no resistance was offered, caused more than a hundred persons to be executed, and compelled the magistrates "to disinter a murdered official with their nails" that he might be accorded a magnificent funeral. The salt tax was reduced in the province which had objected to it, from fear that the district would otherwise call in the English. But Bordeaux lost its privileges and its parliament, which were not restored to it until 1550.

Alliance with Scotland and with the German Protestants: Edict of Chateaubriant (1551).—The influence of Francis, Duke

of Guise, and of his brother Charles, Archbishop of Reims, undoubtedly caused the most useful employment of the resources of France during this reign and had the most salutary effect upon her policy. The princes of Lorraine turned the king's attention towards Germany, reminding him that there had once been an ancient kingdom of Austrasia, of which the capital had been Metz. They also sent help to the Queen-dowager of Scotland, their sister, who refused to marry her daughter, Mary Stuart, to the young King of England, though the latter's crown was his marriage portion. Montmorency, despite the advice of the majority of the council, resumed hostilities against England and for a while hoped to invade that country. Plans of all the English fortresses were secured; the channels of the Thames were sounded; a connection was formed with the Irish, as there was already a connection with Scotland. But the plan did not proceed far towards realisation; Boulogne alone was vigorously attacked, and the English eventually restored that town for a fifth of the stipulated sum, Edward VI. abandoning his claim to the pensions which Henry VIII. had demanded.

In Germany, Charles V., having defeated the Protestants at Mühlberg, found himself more powerful than any emperor had been for five centuries. He kept the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse in prison, settled religious matters at his pleasure without consulting the pope, and political questions without consulting the diet, and was as absolute in the empire as he was in Italy and Spain.

Henry II. did not allow this triumph to become a source of weakness and danger to France. He secretly allied with Maurice of Saxony, one of the emperor's generals, who betrayed him, and published a manifesto in which he declared himself to be the protector of the liberties of Germany. A cap of liberty between two daggers was engraved at the beginning of this document. Like his father, he assured himself of the support of the Turks; he bought back Boulogne from the English and won them over to his side, recalled the French prelates from the Council of Trent, and declared war on the pope, the emperor's ally, by supporting against him the Farnese family in Parma and Piacenza. But he shed the blood of his Protestant subjects, as a species of reparation for undertaking this line of policy which made him the enemy of the orthodox, the friend of heretics or unbelievers. The Edict of Chateaubriant ordered that Protestants should not be allowed an appeal, closed the schools and judicial offices to all who had not a certificate of orthodoxy, and

by a provision borrowed from the worst times of the Roman Empire, assured a third of the goods of their victims to informers.

Conquest of Metz, Toul, and Verdun (1552).—Charles V., surprised by Maurice of Saxony, was almost taken prisoner at Innsbruck and was forced to fly at night by torchlight in a litter and in the midst of a terrible storm (1551). At this news, Henry II. advanced into Lorraine with 30,000 men. Toul opened its gates (March, 1552); Metz, a free and flourishing city, would only allow the commanders of the army to enter, but the soldiers followed and Metz became French. An attempt was made to take Strasburg, another great free city, by the same stratagem, but the burghers replied with cannon fire. Henry was only able to boast that he had watered his horses in the Rhine. On his return journey he entered Verdun. The three cities were included in the list of French provinces under the name of the Three Bishoprics.

Siege of Metz (1552–1553).—This bold advance of France towards her ancient frontiers displeased the emperor more than the treason of Maurice had done. He signed the Convention of Passau with the Lutherans in order to be free to turn all his forces and all his hatred against his secular foe. He invaded Lorraine at the head of 60,000 men. Francis of Guise threw himself into Metz with the flower of the French nobility and prepared for defence by collecting provisions, destroying five abbeys, seven *faubourgs*, and nineteen churches. Fortifications, in the construction of which the nobles themselves assisted, were raised in all haste. The advance guard of the enemy appeared on October 19, 1552, and the attack began on October 30. Charles spent two months on the siege; he fired fourteen thousand shots into the place, opened a breach a hundred paces broad, but was not even able to make an assault, since behind each part of the wall knocked down the besiegers raised a new wall, with ditches, barricades, and mines which destroyed the besiegers' works and frustrated their efforts. The rains began in November; December brought frost and fever. The imperial army had lost a third of its effectives when Charles decided to raise the siege. He retired on January 1 cursing fortune. "I see clearly that fortune is a woman," he said; "she loves a young king better than an old emperor." He should rather have blamed himself, since he had undertaken such an operation at the most unfavourable season of the year. On January 15, the last troops left their camp, leaving behind them a crowd of wounded and dying. "In whatever direction

one looked, one saw nothing but dead soldiers or those who had a little life left in them lying in heaps of dung ; or others seated on great stones, their limbs frostbitten to the knees, unable to rise and crying out for mercy, for some one to put them out of their misery. In the huts, complaint was made of all manner of illnesses. In every direction were vast, new graveyards. The roads were filled with dead horses, with tents, arms, and other goods, all abandoned." The Duke of Guise relieved this terrible misery as far as he could.

Battle of Renty (1554): Victory of Brissac: Abdication of Charles V. (1556).—In the following year, the emperor besieged Thérouanne in Artois. The weak garrison which held it only capitulated after a brave defence ; Charles razed the place to the ground and it has never been rebuilt. Hesdin was treated in the same way, the emperor soothing his wounded pride by waging an atrocious war. In 1554 Henry II. answered ravage by ravage, wasting Hainault and Brabant ; sacking Marienburg, Dinant, and at the other extremity of the Low Countries attacking Renty near St. Omer. The emperor wished to relieve the place ; Guise and Tavannes defeated his cavalry. But the French army, lacking supplies, was obliged to raise the siege.

At the same time, Brissac, by a series of operations which remain models of their kind, maintained himself with a weak army in Piedmont, despite the Duke of Alva, and captured Casal, the capital of Montferrat. Strozzi and Montluc defended Sienna in Tuscany against the Florentines and imperialists ; the Turks threatened Naples, and finally Baron de la Garde, the French admiral in the Levant, sacked the Isle of Elba and effected a landing in Corsica. The defeat of Metz was not repaired ; France seemed to be rejuvenated under her new king, and Charles V. grew weary of this struggle which he had carried on for thirty-five years. He resigned the Low Countries, Italy, and Spain to his son Philip, and sought in the monastery of Yuste that repose which never falls to the lot of ambition (1556).

Alliance between France and the Pope to free Italy (1557).—Charles V. had not left all his crowns to his son ; Austria and the imperial title passed to his brother Ferdinand. The house of Austria was divided, but at the moment at which Philip lost Germany he appeared to acquire England by his second marriage with Mary Tudor. He had already a son, Don Carlos, to whom he reserved all the Spanish possessions, while it was arranged that any son of this new marriage should reign over England

and the Low Countries, so that London and Antwerp would be under the same master, the Thames and Scheldt obey the same laws, and the North Sea become an English lake. And so France, alike in the present and in the future, was seriously threatened by this new domination by which she would be shut in on three sides, and which might open the way for an English invasion. And she could now no longer rely upon the help of Germany. Henry II. had at the beginning of 1556 signed the Treaty of Vaucelles with Charles V.; he broke it in the same year, in order that Philip might not have time to consolidate his position. A fiery old man, Paul IV., then held the papacy; he was alarmed at seeing the Spaniards on either side of him, in Naples and Milan. The king and the pope formed an alliance. An army, commanded by Montmorency, was sent into the Low Countries, while another, under the Duke of Guise, was despatched to Italy. The allies aimed at confining Philip to Spain; Henry II. was to increase his dominion by the acquisition of all the neighbouring provinces which he might easily hold; Francis of Guise, as the descendant of the house of Anjou in the female line, was to be King of Naples. The plan was well conceived. The energetic Paul IV. placed his spiritual weapons at the disposal of France and of the Italian cause, and launched a sentence of excommunication against the *Most Catholic King*.

Battle of St. Quentin (August 10, 1557).—Philip II. ordered Emmanuel-Philibert, Duke of Savoy, who had been despoiled of his lands by the French and owed everything to Spain, to oppose Montmorency; he sent the Duke of Alva, a true Spaniard, utterly devoted to the Church but still more devoted to his king, against Francis of Guise. Guise, who was received in triumph at Rome by Paul IV., penetrated into the Abruzzi, but was checked near Civitella by the clever strategy of his opponent. Emmanuel-Philibert, after a feint attack on Champagne, suddenly fell upon St. Quentin, where he was joined by 7000 English. The place was without walls, munitions, or food. Admiral Coligny threw himself into it with 700 men; Montmorency drew near to revictual it, but came so close to the enemy with an inferior force and took so little care to retain freedom of movement, that he was forced to fight without having assured his retreat. Emmanuel-Philibert turned his position, attacked him in the front and on the flank, and completely defeated him. A Bourbon, the Duke d'Enghien, and a Viscount of Turenne were killed; another Bourbon, the Duke de Montpensier, the Constable Montmorency, Marshal St. André, and the Duke of

Longueville were taken with 4000 men, all the artillery and baggage. The French lost more than 10,000 dead and wounded.

Defence of St. Quentin by Coligny.—"My son is at Paris?" asked Charles V. when he heard, in the depth of his retreat at St. Yuste, of this great French defeat. Philip was not at Paris, nor did he reach that city. His cold and methodical mind, obstinate, but without daring, did not allow him to follow up the victory. Before making any advance, he wished to secure St. Quentin, and that place held out for seventeen days. Coligny, knowing that the safety of France depended on its fate, made heroic efforts to prolong its defence. Time to assemble forces was thus secured, and Philip, after taking Ham and Catelet, retired into the Low Countries, small results following upon a victory which appeared to be as disastrous for France as the defeats of Poitiers and Agincourt.

Recapture of Calais (1558).—Henry II. had recalled the Duke of Guise from Italy in all haste. The victor of Metz and Renty left the Duke of Alva to kneel before the pope while imposing on him the will of Spain, and hastened to receive the title of lieutenant-general of the kingdom with unlimited powers. All the nobles hastened to him; Guise answered the universal expectation. While a feint turned the attention of the enemy towards Luxemburg, the duke suddenly invested Calais (January 1, 1558). The English, relying on the fortifications of the place, and on the marshes by which it was surrounded, had left only 900 men there. Two forts protected the town; that of Nieullay on the land side and that of Risbanck on the side of the sea. Guise attacked the former with vigour and carried it on January 3. Risbanck fell into his power on the same day. On January 6, he attacked the town itself, and next day the garrison capitulated. The last shameful memory of the Hundred Years' War was thus wiped out; the English no longer held an inch of land in France. An attempt to avenge the loss by an attack on Brest was unsuccessful, the Breton peasants driving into the sea some troops who were landed at Conquet. The blow killed Queen Mary. "If my heart is opened," she said as she lay dying, "Calais will be found engraved on it." It shattered also the Anglo-Spanish alliance; Elizabeth, who succeeded her sister Mary on the English throne, effected the triumph of Protestantism in that island, and as a result became the irreconcilable enemy of Spain.

Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis (1559).—Philip II., a man of gloomy and fanatical temperament, aimed at securing the dominion

of Europe by different means from those which his father had adopted. Half Germany and all the Scandinavian kingdoms were separated from Rome; the Reformation, stifled in Italy and Spain, was active in France, extended over the Low Countries, and triumphed in Scotland and England. Philip formed the design of destroying Protestantism. He wished to become the right hand of Catholicism throughout Europe, the right hand of the holy see, the executor of the sentences of the Church. His faith and his ambition were in agreement, since if he slew heresy, he was well aware that this would be to the profit, not only of orthodox Christianity, but also of his own power, and that unity of religion implied the unity of his own dominions. Having this design, a war with France for some frontier places seemed to him to be impolitic at the moment, and he wished to treat with Henry II. in order to win him over to aid his plans. Before peace was concluded some conflicts occurred. Guise took Thionville, Thermes, Dunkirk, Bergues, and Nieuport, but suffered a defeat by allowing himself to be caught at Gravelines between Count Egmont who attacked him in front and an English fleet, the cannon of which played upon his flanks. On April 3, 1559, peace was at last signed.

By this treaty, that of Cateau-Cambrésis, France retained the Three Bishoprics (Metz, Toul, and Verdun) with their territories. She had already recovered Boulogne, and she now retained Calais, undertaking to pay a sum of 500,000 crowns to the English if she did not restore the town within eight years, which she had no intention of doing. The kings of France and Spain mutually restored their conquests on the frontiers of the Low Countries and Italy, with the exception of Piedmont, in which district the French retained several towns until the rights of Henry's grandmother, Louise of Savoy, should have been decided. The acquisitions of France were valuable; she was protected by them against Germany and England. But one of the negotiators, Montmorency, was accused of having sacrificed the interests of his country from his wish to regain his liberty the sooner. France actually ceded Thionville, Marienburg, Montmédy, Damvilliers, the county of Charolais, as well as 189 towns or castles which she had seized in the Low Countries and Italy, in return for the recovery of St. Quentin, Ham, Catelet, and some places of no importance which the Spaniards handed over to them. "Sire," said Guise and Brissac bitterly, "you have surrendered in one day more than you would have lost in thirty years of defeat." The possession of places in Italy

was neither necessary nor advantageous to France, since they offered a constant temptation to engage in further expeditions across the Alps. But wholly French lands, Bugey, Bresse, and Savoy, were abandoned; they should have been preserved at all costs, especially as the Spaniards did not restore to Jeanne d'Albret that part of the kingdom of Navarre which they had held for half a century.

Accidental Death of the King (1559).—It was in order to be free to wage war to the death on heresy that Henry II. had displayed such fatal haste, but he had no time to carry out his design. A double marriage was to cement the peace; Philip II. was to marry Elizabeth, daughter of the French king, and Emmanuel-Philibert was to marry the king's sister, Marguerite. Brilliant fêtes were held before the departure of the princesses. The tournament was still popular, and Henry II. showed much skill and grace in it. After many brilliant passages of arms and when the sports seemed to be ended he wished to have a final course against the captain of his guard, Count Montgomery. The two lances struck each other, but the count did not lower the lance which he held in his hand quickly enough, and striking the king on his visor, his lance pierced it, the point entering Henry's eye and penetrating to his brain. The king fell mortally wounded; eleven days later he died, aged forty-one. It was a serious loss, less on account of the character of Henry II. than because his death left his power to children. Royal authority was absolute; held by a vigorous hand it might have dispelled the dangers with which the new theology and ambitions of all kinds threatened the state, whereas three kings, minors in age or intellect, left France for thirty years a prey to the horrors of a religious and political war.

CHAPTER XLI

GOVERNMENT OF FRANCIS I. AND HENRY II.

Results of the Wars of Francis I. and Henry II.—The Peace of Cateau-Cambrésis ended the first period of the rivalry between the houses of France and Austria. Turned by Charles VIII. from the paths which led to her true greatness, France for sixty-five years made trial of fortune with extraordinary light-heartedness in distant expeditions and in a land "which Nature had divided from her by manners, language, and a lofty chain

of mountains." Four times the French established themselves at Naples; their cannon had reechoed over the lagoons of Venice, and their standards had floated over Sienna, Milan, and Genoa. Defeated at last, France held only some small places in Piedmont, and it was possible to say with Comines, "The French have left no trace in Italy except their graves."

But if France had lost much, she had also gained much. The victories of Fornovo, Ravenna, Marignano, and Cerisoles had wiped out the shame of Guinegate, Pavia, and St. Quentin. The honour of having contended victoriously with Charles V. had increased the prestige of France and had made a nation which a century earlier had been ransomed and pillaged by English archers the foremost state on the continent. Since 1494, she had gained only Calais, Metz, Toul, Verdun, and some minor places in Italy, but she had saved Europe from the hegemony of Charles V. and Germany from the despotism of the house of Austria.

The great danger for France and for Europe in the sixteenth century was the overwhelming power of this Austrian family, which ruled on the Rhine and on the Danube, in Italy and in Spain, and which held a further vast empire across the sea. The war begun by Charles VIII. gave Naples, which was seized by Ferdinand the Catholic, to that dynasty, and Milan was acquired by Charles V. Before 1494, Italy, though corrupt and divided, was at least mistress of herself; the Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis consecrated her servitude, and from that day until the nineteenth century she remained, to her own hurt and to that of Europe, under foreign rulers.

Defeated beyond the Alps, French policy triumphed across the Rhine. Imperial authority, which had been extinct before Charles V., had been momentarily revived by him with the result that there was ground for fearing he would extinguish alike the political and the religious liberties of the states of the empire at one blow. France assisted the German princes to defend themselves, and the Peace of Augsburg guaranteed at once their independence and the triumph of Protestantism (1555). If only the true interests of Germany are considered, this victory of the princes was an evil; the land remained weighed down by a crowd of indigent princelings, the prey of anarchy and oppression, instead of developing into a strong and united state. But it was good for France, because a monarchy, loyally obeyed from the Meuse to the Oder, from the Alps to the North Sea, would have exposed the French monarchy to great dangers.

Two centuries of weakness, misery, and darkness were the result for Germany of the triumph of the princes of the League of Schmalkalde. Nor was the acquisition of Italy any compensation to the house of Austria. Poor and robust, the German people might have enabled their real leader to secure the domination of Europe, while declining Italy was a fair domain which impoverished her foreign master who was forced to honour and defend her.

Internal Political Results: Increase of Royal Power.—The sixteenth century presents a singular contrast. The spirit of revolt is apparent in arts, letters, philosophy, and religion. Everything was reformed except policy. Ancient powers trembled and fell; Gothic architecture gave way before that of the Renaissance, the fables and chivalrous legends of the Middle Ages before the new-found masterpieces of ancient Greece and Rome. Monarchy alone continued its onward march, and the Italian wars consolidated the absolute power of the kings, converting the great states into military monarchies.

In France, the nation had not lost its unity in the face of danger; it had rallied round its king, the symbol of national union and independence. The very nobility, held constantly under the curb, became accustomed to military obedience, and the work begun by Louis XI. on the scaffold was completed by his successors in the camp.

Louis XII. won popularity by his generosity; Francis bound the people to him by his natural gift for command, by his easy magnificence, and by his proud will, which led all to recognise in him their master. From the very first he entered upon the possession of absolute power, and without any pride or desire to oppress he found, as if naturally, the confidant formula with which all his laws conclude, "For such is our good pleasure." And this good pleasure nothing could resist, since the king had under his control a standing army and the whole wealth of the country at his disposal. "France," said a Venetian ambassador in 1546, "is the most united country in the world." And he added, "The will of the king is everything, even in the administration of justice, since no one dares to obey his conscience in opposition to the monarch. I am not speaking of that which it is customary to say, but of that which I have myself observed." Thus with Francis I. began that order of things which is known under the name of the *ancien régime*.

Transformation of Feudalism.—In the middle of the sixteenth century, there remained only one great feudal family, that of

Bourbon-Navarre, whose head, Anthony of Bourbon, had neither consideration nor influence. In addition, there were still great nobles to be found, the families of Montmorency, Guise, La Trémoille, Chatillon, and so forth, but no great vassals. Feudalism had lost authority even more than possessions. Where the lords had preserved their lands, they were jealously watched by the bailiffs and seneschals of the king, who in the name of public order repressed violence, as the parliaments in the name of the law punished crimes. If some distant province escaped this dual supervision, royal commissioners held there *grands jours*, where all complaints were heard and where harsh justice was administered. At that of Poitiers in 1531, five hundred accused persons were tried in two months and a large number of gentlemen were found guilty. The nobles still preserved some rights of justice (which the ordinance of Villers-Cotterets declared to be a mere delegation of royal power) and certain feudal privileges in respect of their vassals which were burdensome to the people. But they might neither administer justice nor coin money; they might neither make laws nor wage private wars. They had, in short, no political power, save in so far as they held offices from the king, save in so far as they became lieutenant-generals, governors of provinces, or held command of armies. Reduced to the enjoyment of incomes and titles, they no longer formed a feudal aristocracy; they became the nobility of France, and that nobility hastened to the court which Francis I. opened to them, there to ruin themselves and to obey.

The Clergy.—The concordat of 1516 placed the clergy in dependence on the king, who became the sole grantor of benefices. Parliament tried to preserve the traditions of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, but an edict of 1529 transferred cognisance of all disputes concerning benefices in royal patronage from Parliament to the Great Council. The Edict of Crémieux (1536) restrained the jurisdiction of the nobles; that of Villers-Cotterets (1539) checked the encroachments of episcopal as against royal tribunals by limiting the competence of the former to spiritual or ecclesiastical cases. Seven-eighths of the suits which came before the courts came before those of the king. At the same time, abbeys were obliged to receive and to support wounded soldiers, and tithes were levied from the clergy, which, though habitually called voluntary gifts, were hardly free-will offerings, especially when they were taken four or five times in one year, amounting on each occasion to 400,000 francs.

The Third Estate.—As for the third estate, it had long been

reduced to obedience. This order included the learned, who were known as "the men of the long robe," merchants, artisans, the people, and the peasants. The merchants, having money, were courted and caressed, but they had neither pre-eminence nor dignity, since every kind of trade was regarded as derogatory for a noble. They paid all taxes in common with the non-noble class and the peasants, the last being the section of the population most roughly treated by the king and by the privileged orders. Content to grow rich, thanks to the good order established by absolute power, the merchants no longer demanded their old communal liberty, which produced an order of things too restless and too expensive for them, and still less modern liberty, which they could attain only after securing equality.

But the "men of the robe" had control of four important offices. "The first was that of the great chancellor, who held the king's seal and without whose advice nothing could be decided," says the Venetian envoy. "The second was that of the secretaries of state who controlled the executive. The third was that of the presidents, councillors, judges, advocates, and all those to whom the administration of civil and criminal justice in the kingdom was entrusted. The fourth was that of the treasurers, collectors, and receivers who administered all the revenues and provided for all the expenses of the crown.

The Parliaments.—The fact that the king chose his chancellor, secretaries, judges, and financiers from the third estate sufficed to secure the development of that order. But the lawyers, from their knowledge, from the fact that their offices were permanent, and from the consideration which they enjoyed, had acquired an importance which inspired them with hope that they might play a great part in the state. Cantoned as it were in their nine fortresses, the parliaments of Aix, Bordeaux, Dijon, Grenoble, Paris, Rennes, Rouen, Toulouse, and Dombes, irremovable from office, and presently given a hereditary position as a result of the sale of offices, the lawyers already possessed two essentially political rights, that of remonstrating against royal ordinances and that of registration, without which no act of the royal will possessed the force of law. Francis I. broke through this last barrier against absolutism, which Louis XII. had respected. In 1527, he forbade the parliament of Paris "to interfere in any matter of state, or with anything except the administration of justice," and would not allow it to comment upon the reforms which he introduced into the legal system. The magistracy submitted; it went further. In Roman law, which

it studied with avidity and which it preserved in order to break down feudal privileges, it found that the emperor was the living embodiment of the law, and in 1527 the president of the parliament of Paris strongly declared that the king was above the laws, though his will should be restrained by reason and equity.

The States-General.—Subdued in detail, the three orders might have recovered their power by union. Francis I. took care not to summon the States-General, replacing them (1526) by an assembly composed partly of notables and partly of the deputies of Burgundy, and later (1527) by an assembly of notables, which aided him in repudiating the Treaty of Madrid, but took no other part in the affairs of state. "Thus," says Suriano, "each did his duty and contributed in his turn to the good of the state, aiding the king, the clergy by their advice, the third estate by their wealth, and the nobles by consecrating their lives to his service, with the result that they have made France invincible and formidable to the rest of the world."

Henry II., like his father, avoided bringing the deputies of the nation face to face with a prodigal court. After St. Quentin, he was, however, forced to summon at least an assembly of notables. In this meeting the members of the parliament sat apart as a fourth estate, ranking after the nobles, but before the third estate. The assembly exhibited its patriotism; the clergy promised a million, the third estate gave two millions; the nobles offered their goods and their lives, giving the latter willingly, but withholding the former.

General Administration.—As a survival of the feudal period, the great offices of the court still remained part of the administration, so that the constable had control of all the armies, the admiral of all the fleets of the kingdom. But in the sixteenth century the later ministerial omnipotence began. The clerks of the closet became secretaries of state, charged with the conduct of all the king's correspondence as to public affairs. An ordinance of Henry II. (1547) fixed their number at four, each of whom corresponded with one-fourth of the kingdom and one-fourth of foreign countries. The assignment of secretaries to special business began at a later date; thus, in time, one was given the management of all matters touching the royal household and later also of all ecclesiastical affairs. The other three secretaries were those of war, created in 1619 and 1636; of foreign affairs, created in 1626; of marine, created under Louis XIV. France was still divided between them geographically so far as the matters which they treated in common were concerned.

The chancellor presided over justice, the superintendent over finance. The secret police began at the same time, that great weapon of monarchical times; Catherine de Medici wrote to Charles IX., "the king has eyes and ears everywhere."

The Army.—In the army, the gendarmerie alone was French; the infantry were foreigners, generally Germans or Swiss. In 1534, Francis I. revived an idea of Charles VII. and tried to create a national infantry. He exempted from the *taille* all men fit for military service who would register themselves. They formed seven regiments, each 6000 strong, commanded by officers nominated by the king. These territorial regiments did not render all the services which were expected from them; the nascent institution was too soon abandoned in order to return to the former bodies, which were more costly and also more warlike, and whom the king paid by means of a new *taille* of 1,200,000 livres. Henry II. revived and improved the plan of his father, but the civil wars disorganised everything and destroyed the territorial troops. Richelieu and Louis XIV. restored this national infantry, so long despised, and it became the first in the world. The direction of the artillery had been centralised by Louis XI. in the hands of a single grand master; Francis increased the duties and pay of this office which became one of the most important in the state. He placed ten provinces, all on the frontiers, under the control of special governors, who were to keep them in a state of good security, well fortified and defended. This was the origin of the great French military governments, the number of which was eventually increased to thirty-two. The need of defending France against the great adversary who threatened her led to the beginning of the construction on the frontiers of a double line of fortresses, and Francis introduced from Italy the construction of earthworks in order to withstand the damage wrought by artillery on stone fortifications.

Navy and Colonies.—Francis I. had a real navy. He equipped galleys on the Mediterranean, and this fleet was so strong and so well led by Baron de la Garde that the French flag there seemed to dominate the sea. On the Atlantic more great ships were built which had both sails and oars, and the port of Le Havre was formed as a base for them.

The colonial movement which has changed the face of the globe began at this time. Francis wished to share in the division of America between the Spaniards and the English. The Basques, Bretons, and Normans founded the fisheries of Newfoundland

in 1504. The explorer Verazzani examined the coasts of North America by the king's order (1524); Jacques Cartier entered the St. Lawrence and discovered Canada (1535). The merchant navy increased naturally without official support. A trader of Dieppe, Ango, having been attacked by the Portuguese during a voyage, blockaded Lisbon and compelled the king to pay an indemnity.

Finances.—An extremely complex administration, numerous armies, the newly-founded fleet, and a luxurious court demanded the expenditure of vast sums. Francis I., in order to be able at will to empty the public purse, united his private revenue with the income of the state by the creation of the *épargne*, "a great sea into which all receipts flowed." Without the assent of the pope, he induced the French clergy to pay a regular subsidy. He raised the *taille* from seven to sixteen millions, increased the *gabelle* (the salt tax), which he extended to all the provinces of the kingdom (1542). In 1522 he borrowed 200,000 livres at 8½ per cent., and thus formed the first permanent *rentes* of the Hôtel de Ville, the origin of the national debt of France. In the same year he created a fourth chamber of the parliament of Paris, in order to secure 1,200,000 livres, and after that date he often sold the offices of law, finance, and administration. This was a disastrous measure, which needlessly increased the number of king's men, diminished the number of those liable to the *taille*, and made the administration of justice more expensive for the people. A still more unhappy idea, borrowed from Italy, was that of a royal lottery (1539). The sale of offices, which made the magistracy hereditary, may be excused by pointing out the fact that from this the great magisterial families, one of the glories of old France, arose; it is rare indeed that an evil is so great that it does not produce even a little good. But the common sense of the people soon warned them that some had sold the judicial offices which they had bought, and as early as 1560 the states of Orleans vigorously complained of this scandalous traffic and demanded its abolition.

The author of the measures of Francis which are most condemned was the Chancellor Duprat, who is described as observing no laws save his own interest and the passions of the king, and as taking money from the people by means which were altogether evil and entirely contrary to the laws and customs of France. Duprat was useful in another way to Francis I. To him were attributed the exactions, violence, and bad faith of the govern-

ment, and the knightly reputation of the king was saved by the odious reputation of the minister.

The financial administration of Henry II. was disastrous; he so increased the loans at high interest, 12 per cent., which his father had introduced, that he left 543,000 livres of debt secured on his towns, and a floating debt of 17,000,000, while the annual sum available for the treasury was only 12,000,000. Before the time of Francis I., the duties on imports produced hardly six or seven thousand livres. Francis increased them, and under Henry II. all foreign goods were indiscriminately taxed on entering the kingdom at the rate of two crowns a quintal and 4 per cent. on their taxable value. Such were the modest beginnings of the protectionist regime.

General Prosperity: Simple Manners of the Nation.—If the taxes were heavy, they were easily borne, since general prosperity increased more rapidly than public expenses. Agriculturists introduced the cultivation of maize from Italy; two Genoese created the silk manufacture of Lyons (1536), and a commercial bank was established in that city. Thus, in opposition to the real wealth of the nobles, the personal wealth of the bourgeoisie was gradually formed; they were at first nothing, but became almost everything. If the land remained, as in the Middle Ages, in the hands of the nobles, capital, the great power of modern times, accumulated in the hands of the traders. Bodin asserts that between 1515 and 1568 more gold was collected in France than it had been possible to collect before in the course of two centuries, and the Venetian envoy pertinently remarks that the bourgeoisie had become the masters of money. Ango, like Jacques Cœur in another age, made the fortune of a prince.

But this prosperity did not destroy the simplicity of the manners of the bourgeoisie. During the reign of Henry II., Gilles le Maitre, first president of the parliament, stipulated in a lease of some land which he possessed near Paris that his farmers, at the four great festivals of the year and at the vintage, should bring him a covered carriage with fresh straw in it, in which his wife and daughter might sit, and an ass for his chamber-maid, while he himself was content to ride before them on his mule, accompanied by his clerk on foot.

CHAPTER XLII

THE RENAISSANCE UNDER FRANCIS I. AND HENRY II.

The Renaissance.—The Middle Ages now passed away. The state had already assumed a new character, only some scattered traces remaining of that which it had so long possessed. Now the human intellect, which was still bound by a thousand ties to ancient ideas, endeavoured to break those bonds. The first struggle had been led by the kings ; every one took part in the second, artists, poets, and doctors joining haphazard in a mood of adventure, and this very impulsiveness contained much that was heroic and captivating.

This revolt against the dominion of the old has received its just epithet, the Renaissance. It was the bright dawn of human reason, the springtime of the soul. After a long and harsh winter, the earth sprang to new life under the kindly rays of the sun. A rich seed had been planted in it ; now it bore a capricious but plentiful harvest, a vegetation which covered and hid the old soil though supported by it ; just as vigorous plants, springing from the foot of an old oak, embrace and protect it with their young roots. Everything was born again—art, science, philosophy—and the world, held fast for two centuries in the morass into which it had fallen during the Middle Ages, now travelled once more towards the light and the purer air of reason.

This revolution has one peculiar characteristic, which makes the sixteenth century one of the great ages of human history. The men of this time looked rather to the past than to the future. They did not feel that confidence in themselves which was later displayed by their descendants. If they abandoned the masters whom they had so lately followed, it was to place themselves under the guidance of other and more ancient masters. But that which was a step backwards was also a step forwards. To return to antiquity was to return, in matters of intellect, to the beautiful, the true, to independence of mind, to that rationalism which, having once been the law of Greek and Roman society, was now to become that of modern civilisation.

The Artistic Renaissance.—When the French crossed the Alps they found in Italy the infancy of a new art. In architecture, the right angle or the arcade, the dome, massive and plain columns, the modest ornaments of Greek and Roman origin

were mingled with those which were the product of a new taste in religious and secular art. The acute angle, the pointed arch, light columns, and the rich ornamentation of the last age of pointed architecture appeared. Statues were no longer hidden in niches on the churches, concealed under the heavy and weighty draperies of the saints. The sculptor worked freely, treating all subjects, studying the nude, studying especially antiquity, the masterpieces of which were constantly being discovered. The painter found on his palette, recently enriched with new colours, the beauty of colour and variety of tonality which gave life to all details and finish to his design. Michael Angelo completed the dome of St. Peter's which Bramante had begun, carving his great statue of Moses, and painting his great picture of the *Last Judgment;* Raphael, the favourite artist of Leo X., gave the world his *School of Athens*, his *Dispute on the Holy Sacrament*, and his divine Madonnas.

France was still far from possessing a school of painting, and could show only excellent stained glass, made by such able workers as Claude and William of Marseilles, whom Julius II. summoned to make the windows of the Vatican, those "marvels fallen from Heaven," as Vasari calls them.

But in architecture and sculpture she had entered on the new path. Roger Ango, the *maître des ouvrages* at Rouen, did not wait until Louis XII. had brought Fra Giocondo from Italy to begin the *Palais de Justice* of the capital of Normandy, one of the masterpieces of monumental art in France. Others raised in Paris the chapel of the *Hôtel de Cluny* and the *Hôtel de La Trémoille*, of which the last remains now adorn the School of Fine Arts. At St. Quentin, Dreux, and Nevers the curious houses of these towns arose; at Blois the eastern façade of the château. Sculpture, which in the middle of the previous century had known so well how to decorate the house of Jacques Cœur at Bourges, did not lag behind her elder sister, as the tombs of George d'Amboise at Rouen and of the Duke of Brittany at Nantes bear witness.

A truly French art was thus formed, which preserved from the past that which seems so suited to the French climate, great, bold masses, as well as that exterior decoration which buildings with flat roofs cannot stand; turrets artistically placed at the angles, arcades in front of the buildings, which permit every variation in the form of the arch and allow the construction of towers of every kind, which serve to break the uniform lines. All that was needed to make this a true Renaissance was

more lightness, grace, and richness, more knowledge of anatomy and of architecture, and above all that regulated irregularity, one of the signs of a period when the human intellect regains its liberty, which covered monuments with beautiful arabesques, garlands of flowers and leaves, graceful dances of imaginary or real beings who run between the pillars of the colonnades, descend the front of the building, or fill the elegant curves of the arches.

France did not therefore owe everything to Francis I., as Benvenuto Cellini affirms, having an interest in promoting the idea that prior to the arrival of the Italian artists the art of the country was wholly barbarous. Yet it is true, as he adds, that the talented received from this king a liberal and powerful measure of protection. Italy, the Italy of Raphael and Michael Angelo, had much to teach France, and Francis I. borrowed both masters and models. He bought or was given in Italy more than a hundred statues, among which were the *Laocoon*, the *Venus de Medici*, and the two slaves of Michael Angelo destined for the tomb of Julius II. He acquired the *Mona Lisa* from Leonardo da Vinci; from Raphael the portrait of *Jeanne of Aragon*, his *St. Michael*, and his *Holy Family*, which are still among the most precious ornaments of the Louvre. By his consideration, friendship, and above all by his favours, he attracted the most distinguished Italian masters to him, among them the aged Leonardo da Vinci, Rosso, Primatice, Andréa del Sarto, Benvenuto Cellini, to build châteaux for him or to decorate his palaces, to excite the emulation of native artists, and to inspire them with a desire to be an honour to the French school.

Fontainebleau, St. Germain, Chambord, Chenonceaux.—The sight of the rich palaces and beautiful villas of Italy had been a revelation to the French and had caused them to realise the icy cold and bareness of the sombre and gloomy manor houses in which their fathers had lived. A new society came into being. At this brilliant court of great lords and young ladies, of poets and artists, new dwellings were needed, and Francis I. supplied them. In the mild valley of the Loire, the favourite sojourn of the Valois, he built the marvel of his reign, the château of Chambord, and that of Azai-le-Rideau; he began Chenonceaux, and completed Amboise.

Fontainebleau arose in the depth of the fairest forest of France at a place where Louis VII., Philip Augustus, and St. Louis had already occupied a manor house, inhabited also by Louis XI.

The great work was begun in 1528; the buildings of the court of the Cheval Blanc, of the Cour Ovale, Cour de la Fontaine, show traces of the influence of the Italian artists. But memorials of the previous age also appear. Fontainebleau was already by the time of Francis I., and later still more so, a medley of buildings of all kinds and of all ages, a "rendezvous of palaces," as it has been called. Tablets and windows of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries appear in the midst of Tuscan columns and under Grecian arcades. The dome lies between little turrets which flank the long pillared galleries. Beautiful sculptures and pagan statues of the Renaissance period are found side by side with the bizarre and grinning figures of the Middle Ages.

In the interior, some of the richest decorations are found in the gallery of Francis I., which Rosso painted and where Benvenuto Cellini placed his silver Jupiter. Another gallery, that of the fêtes, or of Henry II., which Primatice painted, has been almost entirely redecorated since that date.

Chambord has more artistic unity and was an entirely French creation. Pierre Nepveu, an architect of Blois, and not Vignole or Primatice, constructed this wonderful building in the Sologne, the graceful majesty of which strikes the beholder with amazement when he comes in sight of it from one of the long avenues which cut through the great park in the midst of which it stands. Its façade is formed by two rows of galleries and arcades, and by the air and light which they allow to circulate round the building they lighten the donjon which is flanked by four great towers as in the previous age. In the interior, the great staircase, a veritable masterpiece, is surmounted by a graceful cupola which dominates a forest of domes and campaniles scattered over the different points of the building. The "F's" engraved on the marble arches, with the salamanders in the midst of flames, and the traces of the Duchess of Étampes and of the Countess of Chateaubriant which may be recognised in the figures in the carvings, still speak, in the midst of that dismantled glory, of the first guest who dwelled there.

After Chambord may be mentioned Chenonceaux, a smaller and less pretentious building; St. Germain, a more severe château with a military character; Madrid, in the Bois de Boulogne, where traces of Arab architecture may be found; Folembray, near Laon, which the imperialists burned; Villers-Cotterets, which after having sheltered the elegant and joyous court of Francis I., became a retreat for the misery of his old age; and finally the numerous châteaux which the nobles, in imitation

of their king, raised in place of their donjons. Thus Duprat built his sumptuous dwelling of Nantouillet; Semblancay, the château of that name near Tours; Montmorency, Écouen and Chantilly. At Écouen, with borrowed materials Jean Bullant made an original and exquisite work which inaugurated the second period of the Renaissance in France, in which the last traces of the pointed style finally gave place to works formed by imagination playing with ancient models.

Pierre Lescot and the Louvre.—These châteaux were only summer residences. Buildings which were more splendid and more severe, designed to be the official homes of monarchy, arose in the capital, built by French artists. Pierre Lescot, born at Paris in 1510, died in 1571, formed the plan of the Louvre (1541). Four rows of vast walls, pierced at irregular intervals by small windows, flanked by ten towers, and having in their midst a great tower which served as a prison and a treasury, such was the dwelling of the ancient kings of France. It was on the ruins of a building of another age that there arose by degrees a palace which, despite the changes which have been made in it, remains the most complete expression of the French Renaissance. Pierre Lescot only built part of the façade, where the pavilion of *l'Horloge* is found. Outside it there is a ground floor with Corinthian columns; the first floor is of a composite character; the second follows classical types, and is tastefully decorated with the beautiful and shapely sculptures of Jean Goujon and Paul Ponce, which are perhaps a little out of proportion; and the whole is dominated by a central pavilion with bold outlines. Such was the original plan which other artists and other ages developed; it is possible to trace the decline of monumental art in France by studying the various parts of this palace. Henry II., Charles IX., and Henry IV. continued the wing which led towards the Seine, and the building parallel with the river, in which the delicate beauty of the Renaissance genius is shown. But the majestic colonnade of Pérrault is cold with its heavy and bare decoration, and one has only to compare that part of the façade facing the Seine which was built by Louis XIV., with that which was executed under Henry II. and Henry IV., to see what art has lost. In the latter, stone lives and speaks; in the former it is solemn and mournful.

Philibert Delorme and the Tuileries.—The second great French architect of this period, Philibert Delorme, had crossed the Alps (1534) in order to study the monuments of antiquity and the palaces of the Renaissance. On his return to Lyons, his native place, he built there the beautiful gateway of St. Nizier; then

Cardinal Bellay attracted him to Paris and brought him to the notice of Henry II. He continued Fontainebleau and made the plans of the châteaux of Anet, Meudon, and St. Maur. Catherine de Medici made him her superintendent of buildings. She had brought a taste for literature and the arts from Tuscany. Philibert Delorme, in one of his writings, praises her for the great pleasure which she took in architecture, drawing up and preparing the plans and elevations of the buildings which she wished constructed. It was by her orders that he began (1564) the château of the Tuileries. The central pavilion (then surmounted by a beautiful cupola and by four campaniles, which have unhappily been replaced by an unsightly square dome), two parallel galleries (with their entrances in arcades, surmounted by terraces of which one has been removed), and the two first pavilions, built with Ionian and Corinthian pillars conjoined, were the work of Philibert Delorme. Henry IV. altered this graceful *ensemble* and enlarged it by two masses of buildings; Louis XIII. caused the construction of the massive pavilions of Flore and Marsan, which completed the château. Louis XIV. united the masterpieces of Pierre Lescot and Philibert Delorme by continuing the great gallery of the Louvre to the Tuileries.

Architecture is pre-eminent among the plastic arts; the others are its servants. The great French architects found sculptors to interpret their thought and to give to the buildings which they raised that rich and light ornamentation which is now a lost art. The tomb of Louis XII. at St. Denis is a building of rare elegance, with its twelve open arcades, under which the twelve apostles are seated; the bas-reliefs which decorate its lower stories, the four great figures placed at the angles, and the two statues of the king and queen which crown the structure. It was perhaps the work of Italian artists, if Jean Juste of Tours came originally from Florence, but the cenotaphs of Jacques de Brézé, of Admiral Chabot, and of Francis I. are certainly the work of Frenchmen. Philibert Delorme designed the last, which may still be admired at St. Denis. The bas-reliefs represent the great deeds of the king and are the work of an unknown Frenchman, who gave to his country his pupil, Jean Goujon, the greatest of her sculptors.

Jean Goujon, Germain Pillon, Jean Cousin, Bernard Palissy.—Jean Goujon has deserved the epithets of the *French Phidias* and the *Corrector of sculpture*. He combined a knowledge of anatomy with sureness of touch and finished skill with the chisel; his style was vigorous yet full of grace. The chief

examples of his work which remain are his caryatides in the *Salle des Gardes* at the Louvre, the beautiful figures on the fountain of the Innocents, a group of Diana the Huntress, and possibly the tomb of Louis de Brézé, which his widow Diana of Poitiers, at the time of her extreme grief, caused to be built in the cathedral of Rouen, where it still is.

Germain Pillon executed, in the year of Francis I.'s death, some of the "saints of Soulesmes." To his facile chisel are due the sculptures on the mausoleum of Henry II., which were designed by Philibert Delorme, the tombs of the Chancellor Birague and of William du Bellay, and especially the group of the *Three Graces* cut out of a single block of marble.

Jean Cousin, who was born at Soucy near Sens in 1501, was both a sculptor and a painter. His statue of Admiral Chabot places him on a level with Germain Pillon; he was without a rival in France during the sixteenth century for his windows and oil paintings. Rosso and Primatice, by their grand decorations of the palace of Fontainebleau, "that second Rome," as Vasari calls it, had popularised fresco and oil painting and were imitated by a large number of pupils. Cousin did not learn directly from them, but was doubtless inspired by their work. The windows which he designed for Sens, Metz, and Vincennes place him in the first rank, and more especially his *Legend of St. Eutropius* in the cathedral of Sens. His *Last Judgment*, which is now in the Louvre, is a composition full of fire and of originality, which recalls Michael Angelo by the boldness of its design, its anatomical knowledge, and his richness of imagination. Unfortunately Cousin, like the majority of the great designers, was a poor colourist, especially in his oil painting.

Beside these great names, place must be given to that of the heroic Bernard Palissy. He was a potter, born in Agenois about 1500. After sixteen years of effort and of ruinous expense, he discovered the secret of enamel in 1555, which had been preserved in Italy, and made potteries which are still admired. He was the precursor of Buffon and Cuvier in geology.

Pointed architecture, defeated by the Renaissance, was still trying to uphold itself. There remain curious evidences of this struggle and of the compromise which resulted from it. In St. Eustace at Paris and St. Michael at Dijon it is possible to study that hybrid style which was certainly not without elegance and grandeur.

The church of St. Michael at Dijon was entirely rebuilt between 1499 and 1529, except the towers which were not com-

pleted until the seventeenth century. In its general plan it is an example of the pointed style, but the gateway, constructed by Hugh Sambin of Dijon, the friend and pupil of Michael Angelo, while preserving the innumerable sculptures of the preceding age, yet presents an arch of plain style, and in the towers the four traditional orders. The reconstruction of St. Eustace at Paris began in 1532 and was not completed until 1642. Mansart gave it a heavily designed Greek gateway which happily can hardly be seen ; the interior has the most majestic effect.

The Literary Renaissance.—In the fifteenth century literary activity was confined, except in the case of some rare spirits, to the subtleties of scholasticism, expressed in barbarous Latin. The sciences, studied without method, were adventurous and delivered over to superstitious practices. The French language had freshness and force, but lacked amplitude, eloquence, and clearness of expression. Imagination, good sense, and Gallic gaiety appeared in prose and verse, but triviality, diffuseness, and ill-taste disfigured the best books. But antiquity was not rediscovered by the artists alone. The writers also drew from this rich source, and the genius of France, refreshed in this way, acquired that lofty reason, that proportion and limpid clarity which secured for it a peaceful dominion over Europe.

The College of France and the Royal Printers.—Francis I. did not create a movement which was spontaneous in letters any more than in arts ; but he assisted it. The old University of Paris, with its faculty of theology, the Sorbonne, could not change its spirit and its method. On the model of the Italian academies and by the advice of the savant Budé, the king founded in 1530 an entirely lay establishment, *the College of the Three Languages*, or the *College of France*. Hebrew, Greek, Latin, medicine, mathematics, philosophy, all that was new or which might be treated in a novel manner, was taught there gratuitously. The Hebraist Vatable, the Hellenist Danès, the mathematician and orientalist Postel, the savant Turnèbe, and the logician Lambin drew to their lectures the pupils to whom the university so sparingly imparted knowledge, and who might hope to hear there Erasmus of Rotterdam, who may in a sense be called the Voltaire of this period. The king offered him the directorship of the new college, but he refused it.

A model printing establishment, rich in characters of all languages, and able to undertake work beyond the scope of private enterprise, was a necessary adjunct to the *College of France*. Francis I. did not create the royal printing press, which

only dates from the reign of Louis XIII. (1640), but he caused the characters of Garamond to be engraved and cast according to the best models of the Venetian type of Aldus Manucius. Garamond, by his orders, entrusted them to the royal printers for use in their best editions. Francis bought manuscripts of ancient authors in Italy, Greece, and Asia, in order to increase the nascent wealth of the royal library, and he caused many to be edited. The family of Estienne acquired a deserved celebrity for the beauty and accuracy of the editions issued by their press.

Scholarship.—Danès, Postel, Dolet, the great Ciceronian Budé, Lefevre d'Étaples, the first Hellenist in Europe, and twenty others edited, with notes and commentaries, a number of works of antiquity both sacred and profane. These indefatigable workers have their place in the civilisation of the world. They appear as pale phantoms, dwelling only with the dead. But it was the rich seed of ancient wisdom which they garnered and spread so freely over new lands. They turned their attention to the roots of civilisation and repaired the broken bonds which united France to the ages of the past and to the great races of mankind. Their learned publications seemed wholly alien from everyday life, but in actual fact they placed in intellectual circulation ideas, knowledge, and types of style which made the renaissance of French literature possible. Already some went far afield and visited Rome and Greece. Postel visited Asia and was acquainted with Hebrew, Arabic, and Armenian. The East was touched upon, though she preserved her mysteries for three centuries longer, to yield them at last in modern times. This contact with antiquity reanimated and strengthened the French national spirit. It supplied the guides and models which had been lacking and enabled it to begin its first great literary age. From this time, it advanced with honour and even with glory over the whole field of literature.

Jurisprudence.—The study of the law surpassed all others in the sixteenth century. The Italian, Alciat, summoned to Bourges by Francis I. in 1529, applied philology to the study of the law. His disciples went further. By means of his erudition the great Cujas restored the text of the Roman jurists and founded the fertile study of the history of law, "that golden hook with which it is possible to seize the true force and knowledge of laws." Pierre Pithou (1596), Denis Godefroy, who published his *Corpus Juris* in 1586, the profound Doneau (1591), and Francis Hottman (1590) rendered other services to the same study. Dumoulin, whom his contemporaries called "the prince of lawyers," was

an advocate of the parliament of Paris and caused the light of French law to arise from the chaos of local customs. Thanks to the work of these men, others such as Ollivier, Michael de l'Hôpital, Harlay, and de Thou, profound jurists or austere and devoted magistrates, were able, in the midst of the most terrible religious discord, to improve the civil law and to prepare the rational unity of French law.

Philosophy.—The Middle Ages were ignorant of Plato; Aristotle reigned without a rival. Ramus, informed by reading the works of the pupil of Socrates, was the first in France to cast off the yoke of superstitious reverence for the Stagirite and his dull commentators. To attack Aristotle through Plato was to substitute one authority for another, but this divided dominion was less burdensome and, wavering between the two masters, human reason began to seek the truth for itself instead of receiving everything from their hands. Ramus had already advised such independent thought: "Why should not discussion be conducted with the freedom of common sense rather than with servile submission to the authority of masters? Why should we not imitate Socrates?" Descartes was Socratic in the following age.

Medicine.—The study of Hippocrates and Galen led to the restoration of the practice of using experience and observation in medicine. Ambrose Paré became the father of French surgery and was a kind of providence to the soldiers at Boulogne, Metz, and St. Quentin. As modest as he was skilful, he said of his patients, "I dress their wounds, God heals them."

Sciences.—In the domain of science France had one great name in this period, that of Viète, who was the precursor of Descartes and Newton, to whom he showed the way in mathematical analysis. In his algebraical calculus he designated known quantities by letters and was thus the founder of the application of algebra to geometry.

Prose Literature.—Literature could not remain unaffected by that Renaissance which appeared in the arts and sciences. But, except in the *Essais* of Montaigne, the matter is better than the form. The age thought much, but language failed it and this lack of accord prevented it from attaining to that harmonious beauty which is found so fully in the art of the period. The *Vie du Chevalier Sans Peur et Sans Reproche*, written by his secretary, the *Loyal Serviteur*, and the memoirs of Fleuranges, the *Jeune Adventureux*, appear as the last echoes of the naïf chronicles of the Middle Ages. The memoirs of the brothers Martin du

Bellay are the instructive work of diplomatists and statesmen, valuable to consult, but monotonous and without spirit. Blaise de Montluc, a fierce Catholic, was not afraid to borrow from Caesar the title of his *Commentaries*, which Henry IV. called the *Soldier's Bible*. The two Tavannes, La Noue, who was a second Bayard, Vieilleville, related their own acts and that which they had seen ; others did likewise, and France has in their memoirs one of the most curious forms of historical literature. The prudent de Thou (died 1617) went further in his vast and conscientious *Histoire Universelle*. Brantôme descended to a lower plane in his anecdotes. He was the Suetonius after the Livy of the period, if de Thou, who unfortunately wrote in Latin, may be placed on a level with the great historian of Rome. Brantôme has preserved the *Nouvelles* of the Queen of Navarre and those of Despériers, feeble imitations of the *Decameron* of Boccaccio.

A young man of eighteen, Etienne de la Boétie, in his discourse on *La Servitude Voluntaire* or *Le Contre Un*, written in Bordeaux to the sound of the executions ordered by the fierce Montmorency in 1548, found energetic and burning words in which to scourge tyranny set in the place of government. A little later Jean Bodin (born in 1530) in his work *La Republique*, on the organisation of the state, studied the various forms of polity and sought for the best constitution. The first of these works was no more than a brilliant declamation, the latter only an uncertain sketch.

Michael Eyquem, born at the château of Montaigne in 1533, five leagues from Bergerac, was for five years mayor of Bordeaux (1580). But " he loved too well " to care much for public affairs, the boredom they involved and the dangers which at times were associated with them. When a plague occurred he was the first to fly. That Montaigne was no hero his works clearly reveal. His *Essais* are, from their charm of style and their ingenuity of thought, the most instructive and attractive moral study of man, but their plan is not striking, nor have they that vigorous treatment of subjects and that implacable logic which necessarily result from strong political or religious conviction. They are marked by uncertainty as to right and wrong. " My judgment," he says, " is so evenly balanced with regard to most things that I willingly leave the decision to fate and to the gods." But if he were dubious as to human opinions, he had no doubt as to virtue, though his virtue is pleasant, not austere. " Why is virtue depicted," he asks, " with a pale and forbidding visage ? There is nothing more gay, more joyous, even more amusing.

Virtue is not planted, as the Schools teach, at the top of a rugged, barren, inaccessible mountain, on some steep rock among thorns, a phantom to terrify mankind. It may be attained by fertile, pleasant, sweetly flowering paths." He was right, if on so fair a path virtue were not forgotten. Montaigne went that road, across fertile and flowery plains, and on his way he imitated "the bees who gather here and there among the flowers, making all into honey which is their own; no more thyme or marjoram." Montaigne did likewise with the thoughts and images which he met in the ancient writers; he stole everywhere and made that which he stole his own, with the result that he is an admirable and most reserved talker, a prudent politician who uses the language of the independent philosopher. "Princes do me enough good when they do me no harm." He is even heroic when he displays defeats which are more triumphant than victories; the brave man who remains obstinately courageous, who faced by imminent death loses none of his assurance, who still looks his foe boldly in the face with firm and disdainful gaze, and who is beaten not by man but by fate, who is slain but not vanquished.

The *Essais* of Montaigne were preceded by a translation of the historical and moral works of Plutarch, compiled by Amyot (1513–1593), a translation marked by genius and which gave in French all that ancient science which the philosopher of Cheronea had collected in his books. Montaigne described the work of Amyot as *Our Breviary*.

But the Middle Ages did not give place to the Renaissance without a struggle; the spirit of the old was converted into the new. In the works of Francis Rabelais (1483–1553) the curious struggle between new and old appears. Born at Chinon, first a friar, then a doctor, and finally curé of Meudon, Rabelais in his *Vie de Gargantua et de Pantagruel*, as in his own life, showed a mingling of the most discordant elements, not their harmonious fusion. His book, in which reason speaks the language of folly and laughter is only biting satire, unites the daring thoughts of the Renaissance with the grotesque imaginations of the Middle Ages. Commentators have recognised in the characters of the romance the chief personages of the time, Francis I. as Gargantua, Louis XII. as Grand-Geusior, Henry II. as Pantagruel, the Cardinal of Lorraine as Panurge. Rabelais himself says, "That which we think in lightness of heart must be interpreted in the highest sense." He had clearly no taste for the scaffold or a state prison, but with his wine-stained

face and his fool's bells he talked more freely and boldly than any one.

Drama and Poetry.—A renaissance made by the *savants* and the erudite could owe little of its inspiration to the free and popular spirit of the drama and of poetry. The *Brothers of the Passion* continued with the same courage to hold their everlasting performances, but taste became more severe and piety more enlightened. Material devotion, displayed on the trestles and seasoned by licentiousness, was felt to be an outrage to religion and by an edict of 1548 parliament struck the deathblow of the old mysteries. Popular drama reached its culmination in the *Prince des Sots* and *La Mère Sotte* of Pierre Gringoire. Men were amused by obvious allusions to the people, the Church, to types less generally known, and to prominent individuals. Parliament ended this amusement by an edict of 1536 which forbade the exhibition of any spectacle which alluded to any personage whatsoever. The popular drama was not perfected by the Renaissance, but replaced. Some learned poets had already translated Greek and Latin pieces. Jodelle composed the first regular French tragedy, *Cleopatre*, performed before Henry II. in 1552. With this play, before an audience of courtiers, the modern theatre was born. History took the place of the Bible; the human drama replaced the religious drama. The French theatre preserved from antiquity and from the court in which it originated something traditional, something conventional, which prevented it from acquiring the popularity of the old mysteries.

The poets did not fall so easily. Clement Marot, who died in 1554, introduced at the court, at the risk of unfortunate results, that poetry which Villon had popularised in the Paris streets. At court the poems acquired more delicacy and elegance without losing their vigour and malice. Marot had been a page of Francis I., had fought with him at Pavia, and was there taken prisoner. Having translated the Psalms, he was accused of reformed opinions and persecuted many times, dying in misery at Turin. Boileau urged imitation of Marot's elegant badinage, his verse were full of spirit and grace, but with little force, and his own remark that death would not slay them is true only in some instances.

Ronsard attempted to give French poetry the strength which it lacked by making it Latin and Greek, wasting on this useless attempt the true sensibility of his soul and the real power of his genius. One of his pupils, Joachim du Bellay, sketched in his

Defense et Illustration de la Langue Française (1548) the scheme of that new poetry which Ronsard adopted. Ronsard borrowed not only the ancient forms of the ode and epic poem, their ideas and metaphors, but even their construction of phrases and composition of words. In the dedication of his works to Henry II. he says :

> ". . . C'est, prince, un livre d'odes
> Qu'autrefois je sonnai suivant les vieilles modes,
> D'Horace calabrais et Pindare thébain."

In his *Franciade* he hoped to equal Homer and Virgil, and his age, enamoured of antiquity, almost agreed that he had done so. The most illustrious savants and the most judicious minds, the Scaligers and de Thous, had adoration for him, and Charles IX. wrote to him :

> " Je puis donner la mort; toi, l'immortalité,"

and also,

> " Tous deux également nous portons des couronnes;
> Mais roi, je la reçois; poëte, tu la donnes."

Nothing of Ronsard has remained popular except a few well-turned verses; his only other true title to fame is that he handed down to his successors a greater elevation and nobility, or rather solemnity, of language. He was the founder of the " sublime " style which has remained with us and which so often hides the emptiness of ideas under the magnificence of wording in which those ideas are clothed. Ronsard assembled round him a society of poets, whom he called, in memory of the Alexandrine poets, the *Pleïade*. They were six in number, du Bellay, Baif, Belleau, Jodelle, Jamyn, and Ponthus de Thiard. Another of his disciples, Dubartas, " in whom the French muse spoke Greek and Latin," showed by his very exaggeration in his *Semaine de la Creation* the folly of those innovators who looked ever to the past.

Finally we come to Malherbe who opened the great age of French literature, the seventeenth century.

Made At The Temple Press Letchworth In Great Britain

EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY

EDITED BY ERNEST RHYS

A CLASSIFIED LIST
OF THE FIRST 930 VOLUMES

In Cloth Binding
In Special Library Binding
Also Selected Volumes in Leather

EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY

CLASSIFIED LIST *of* 930 VOLS. *in* 13 SECTIONS

In each section of this list the volumes are arranged, as a general rule, alphabetically under the authors' names. Where authors appear in more than one section, a reference is given, viz.: (See also FICTION*). The number at the end of each item is the number of the volume in the series.*

Volumes temporarily out of print are marked ‡.
Volumes obtainable in Leather are marked L

BIOGRAPHY

Audubon the Naturalist, Life and Adventures of. By R. Buchanan. 601
Baxter (Richard), Autobiography of. Edited by Rev. J. M. Lloyd Thomas, 868
Beaconsfield (Lord), Life of. By J. A. Froude. 666
Berlioz (Hector), Life of. Translated by Katherine F. Boult. 602
Blackwell (Dr. Elizabeth): Pioneer Work for Women. With an Introduction by Mrs. Fawcett. 667
L Boswell's Life of Johnson. 2 vols. 1–2
(*See also* TRAVEL)
Browning (Robert), Life of. By E. Dowden. 701
Buxton (Sir Thomas Fowell), Memoirs of. Edited by Charles Buxton. Introduction by Lord Buxton. 773
Carey (William), Life of: Shoemaker and Missionary. 395
Carlyle's Letters and Speeches of Cromwell. 3 vols. 266–8
" Reminiscences. 875
(*See also* ESSAYS *and* HISTORY)
L Cellini's (Benvenuto) Autobiography. 51
Cibber's (Colley) An Apology for his Life. 668
Constable (John), Memoirs of. By C. R. Leslie, R.A. 563
Cowper (William), Selected Letters of. Intro. by W. Hadley, M.A. 774
(*See also* POETRY AND DRAMA)
De Quincey's Reminiscences of the Lake Poets. Intro. by E. Rhys. 163
(*See also* ESSAYS)
De Retz (Cardinal): Memoirs. By Himself. 2 vols. 735–6
Evelyn's Diary. 2 vols. Introduction by G. W. E. Russell. 220–1
Forster's Life of Dickens. Intro. by G. K. Chesterton. 2 vols. 781–2
(*See also* FICTION)
Fox (George), Journal of. Text revised by Norman Penney, F.S.A. Introduction by Rufus M. Jones, LL.D. 754
Franklin's (Benjamin) Autobiography. 316
Froude's Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield. 666
L Gaskell's (Mrs.) Life of Charlotte Brontë. Intro. by May Sinclair. 318
Gibbon (Edward), Autobiography of. Intro. by Oliphant Smeaton. 511
(*See also* HISTORY)
Gladstone, Life of. By G. W. E. Russell ('Onlooker'). 661
Hastings (Warren), Life of. By Capt. L. J. Trotter. 452
Helps' (Sir Arthur) Life of Columbus. 332
Hodson, of Hodson's Horse. By Capt. L. J. Trotter. 401
Holmes' Life of Mozart. Introduction by Ernest Newman. 564
Houghton's Life and Letters of Keats. Introduction by Robert Lynd. 801
Hutchinson (Col.), Memoirs of. Intro. Monograph by F. P. G. Guizot. 317
Irving's Life of Mahomet. Introduction by Professor E. V. Arnold. 513
Johnson's Lives of the Poets. Intro. by Mrs. Archer-Hind, M.A. 770–1
Lamb (Charles), Letters of. 2 vols. 342–3
(*See also* ESSAYS *and* FOR YOUNG PEOPLE)
Lewes' Life of Goethe. Introduction by Havelock Ellis. 269
Lincoln (Abraham), Life of. By Henry Bryan Binns. 783
(*See also* ORATORY)
Lockhart's Life of Robert Burns. Introduction by E. Rhys. 156
L " Life of Napoleon. 3
" Life of Sir Walter Scott (abridged). 55
Mazzini, Life of. By Bolton King, M.A. 562
Newcastle (First Duke of), Life of, and other writings by the Duchess of Newcastle. 722

BIOGRAPHY—*continued*

Outram (Sir J.), The Bayard of India. By Capt. L. J. Trotter. 396
Pepys' Diary. Lord Braybrooke's 1854 ed. 2 vols. 53–4
Plutarch's Lives of Noble Greeks and Romans. Dryden's Translation. Revised, with Introduction, by Arthur Hugh Clough. 3 vols. 407–9
Rousseau, Confessions of. 2 vols. 859–60
Scott's Lives of the Novelists. Introduction by George Saintsbury. 331
(*See also* FICTION *and* POETRY)
Seebohm (Frederic): The Oxford Reformers. With a Preface by Hugh E. Seebohm. 665
Smeaton's A Life of Shakespeare, with Criticisms of the Plays. 514
Southey's Life of Nelson. 52
Strickland's Life of Queen Elizabeth. 100
Swift's Journal to Stella. Newly deciphered and edited by J. K. Moorhead. Introduction by Sir Walter Scott. 757
(*See also* ESSAYS *and* FOR YOUNG PEOPLE)
Vasari's Lives of the Painters. Trans. by A. B. Hinds. 4 vols. 784–7
Voltaire's Life of Charles XII. Introduction by Rt. Hon. J. Burns. 270
Walpole (Horace), Selected Letters of. Intro. by W. Hadley, M.A. 775
Wellington, Life of. By G. R. Gleig. 341
Wesley's Journal. 4 vols. Intro. by Rev. F. W. Macdonald. 105–8
Woolman's (John) Journal and Other Papers. Introduction by Vida D. Scudder. 402

CLASSICAL

Æschylus' Lyrical Dramas. Translated by Professor J. S. Blackie. 62
Aristophanes' The Frogs, The Clouds, The Thesmophorians. 516
" The Acharnians, The Knights, and The Birds. Frere's Translation. Introduction by John P. Maine. 344
Aristotle's Politics. Introduction by A. D. Lindsay. 605
" Poetics, etc., and Demetrius on Style, etc. Edited by [Rev. T. A. Moxon. 901
(*See also* PHILOSOPHY)
Cæsar's The Gallic War and Other Commentaries. Translated by W. A. McDevitte. 702
Cicero's Essays and Select Letters. Intro. Note by de Quincy. 345
L Epictetus, Moral Discourses, etc. Elizabeth Carter's Translation. Edited by W. H. D. Rouse, M.A. 404
Euripides' Plays in 2 vols. Introduction by V. R. Reynolds. Translated by M. Wodhull and R. Potter, with Shelley's 'Cyclops' and Dean Milman's 'Bacchanals'. 63, 271
Herodotus. Rawlinson's Translation. Edited, with Introduction, by E. H. Blakeney, M.A., omitting Translator's Original Essays, and Appendices. 2 vols. 405–6
L Homer's Iliad. Lord Derby's Translation. 453
L " Odyssey. William Cowper's Translation. Introduction by Miss F. M. Stawell. 454
Horace. Complete Poetical Works. 515
Hutchinson's (W. M. L.) The Muses' Pageant. Vols. I, II, and III. 581, 606 and 671
Livy's History of Rome. Vols. I–VI. Translated by Rev. Canon Roberts. 603, 669, 670, 749, 755, and 756
Lucretius: On the Nature of Things. Translated by W. E. Leonard. 750
L Marcus Aurelius' Meditations. Introduction by W. H. D. Rouse. 9
L Plato's Dialogues. 2 vols. Introduction by A. D. Lindsay. 456–7
L " Republic. Translated, with an Introduction, by A. D. Lindsay. 64
Plutarch's Moralia. 20 Essays translated by Philemon Holland. 565
Sophocles' Dramas. Translated by Sir G. Young, Bart. 114
Thucydides' Peloponnesian War. Crawley's Translation. 455
L Virgil's Æneid. Translated by E. Fairfax-Taylor. 161
" Eclogues and Georgics. Translated by T. F. Royds, M.A. 222
Xenophon's Cyropædia. Translation revised by Miss F. M. Stawell. 672

ESSAYS AND BELLES-LETTRES

L Anthology of Prose. Compiled and Edited by Miss S. L. Edwards. 675
Arnold's (Matthew) Essays. Introduction by G. K. Chesterton. 115
" " Study of Celtic Literature, and other Critical Essays, with Supplement by Lord Strangford, etc. 458
(*See also* POETRY)
L Bacon's Essays. Introduction by Oliphant Smeaton. 10
(*See also* PHILOSOPHY)
Bagehot's Literary Studies. 2 vols. Intro. by George Sampson. 520–1
‡ Brooke's (Stopford, M.A.) Theology in the English Poets. 493
L Brown's Rab and his Friends, etc. 116

Burke's Reflections on the French Revolution and contingent Essays. Introduction by A. J. Grieve, M.A. 460 (*See also* ORATORY)
Canton's (William) The Invisible Playmate, W. V., Her Book, and In Memory of W. V. 566 (*See also* FOR YOUNG PEOPLE)
Carlyle's Essays. 2 vols. With Notes by J. Russell Lowell. 703–4
" Past and Present. Introduction by R. W. Emerson. 608
L " Sartor Resartus and Heroes and Hero Worship. 278
(*See also* BIOGRAPHY *and* HISTORY)
Castiglione's The Courtier. Translated by Sir Thomas Hoby. Introduction by W. H. D. Rouse. 807
L Century of Essays. A. An Anthology of English Essayists. 653
Chesterfield's (Lord) Letters to his Son. 823
L Chesterton's (G. K.) Stories, Essays, and Poems. 913
Coleridge's Biographia Literaria. Introduction by Arthur Symons. 11
" Essays and Lectures on Shakespeare, etc. 162
(*See also* POETRY)
‡ Craik's Manual of English Literature. 346
Curtis's Prue and I, and Lotus Eating. Introduction by H. W. Mabie. 418
De Quincey's (Thomas) Opium Eater Intro. by Sir G. Douglas. 223
" " The English Mail Coach and Other Writings. Introduction by S. Hill Burton. 609
(*See also* BIOGRAPHY)
Dryden's Dramatic Essays. With an Introduction by W. H. Hudson. 568
Elyot's Gouernour. Intro. and Glossary by Prof. Foster Watson. 227
L Emerson's Essays. First and Second Series. 12
L " Nature, Conduct of Life, Essays from the 'Dial'. 322
" Representative Men. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 279
" Society and Solitude and Other Essays. 567
(*See also* POETRY)
Florio's Montaigne. Introduction by A. R. Waller, M.A. 3 vols. 440–2
Froude's Short Studies. Vols. I and II. 13, 705
(*See also* HISTORY *and* BIOGRAPHY)
Gilfillan's Literary Portraits. Intro. by Sir W. Robertson Nicoll. 348
Goethe's Conversations with Eckermann. Intro. by Havelock Ellis 851. (*See also* FICTION *and* POETRY)
Goldsmith's Citizen of the World and The Bee. Intro. by R. Church. 902
(*See also* FICTION and POETRY)
Hamilton's The Federalist. 519
Hazlitt's Lectures on the English Comic Writers. 411
" Shakespeare's Characters. 65
" Spirit of the Age and Lectures on English Poets. 459
" Table Talk, 321
" Plain Speaker. Introduction by P. P. Howe. 814
L Holmes' Autocrat of the Breakfast Table. 66
" Poet at the Breakfast Table. 68
" Professor at the Breakfast Table. 67
L Hudson's (W. H.) A Shepherd's Life. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 926
Hunt's (Leigh) Selected Essays. Introduction by J. B. Priestly. 829
L Irving's Sketch Book of Geoffrey Crayon. 117
(*See also* BIOGRAPHY *and* HISTORY)
Landor's Imaginary Conversations and Poems: A selection. Edited with Introduction by Havelock Ellis. 890
L Lamb's Essays of Elia. Introduction by Augustine Birrell. 14
(*See also* BIOGRAPHY *and* FOR YOUNG PEOPLE)
Lowell's (James Russell) Among My Books. 607
Macaulay's Essays. 2 vols. Introduction by A. J. Grieve, M.A. 225–6
L " Miscellaneous Essays and The Lays of Ancient Rome. 439
(*See also* HISTORY *and* ORATORY)
Machiavelli's Prince. Special Trans. and Intro. by W. K. Marriott. 280
(*See also* HISTORY)
Martinengo-Cesaresco (Countess): Essays in the Study of Folk-Songs 673
Mazzini's Duties of Man, etc. Introduction by Thomas Jones, M.A. 224
Milton's Areopagitica, etc. Introduction by Professor C. E. Vaughan. 795
(*See also* POETRY)
L Mitford's Our Village. Edited, with Introduction, by Sir John Squire. 927
Montagu's (Lady) Letters. Introduction by R. Brimley Johnson. 69
Newman's On the Scope and Nature of University Education, and a paper on Christianity and Scientific Investigation. Introduction by [Wilfred Ward. 723
(*See also* PHILOSOPHY)
Osborne's (Dorothy) Letters to Sir William Temple. Edited and connotated by Judge Parry. 674
Penn's The Peace of Europe. Some Fruits of Solitude, etc. 724
Prelude to Poetry, The. Edited by Ernest Rhys. 789

Reynold's Discourses. Introduction by L. March Phillipps. 118
L Rhys' New Book of Sense and Nonsense. 813
Rousseau's Emile. Translated by Barbara Foxley. 518
(*See also* PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY)
L Ruskin's Crown of Wild Olive and Cestus of Aglaia. 323
" Elements of Drawing and Perspective. 217
" Ethics of the Dust. Introduction by Grace Rhys. 282
" Modern Painters. 5 vols. Introduction by Lionel Cust. 208–12
" Pre-Raphaelitism. Lectures on Architecture and Painting, Academy Notes, 1855–9, and Notes on the Turner Gallery. Introduction by Laurence Binyon. 218
L " Sesame and Lilies, The Two Paths, and The King of the Golden River. Introduction by Sir Oliver Lodge. 219
" Seven Lamps of Architecture. Intro. by Selwyn Image. 207
" Stones of Venice. 3 vols. Intro. by L. March Phillipps. 213–15
" Time and Tide with other Essays. 450
" Unto This Last, The Political Economy of Art. 216
(*See also* FOR YOUNG PEOPLE)
Spectator, The. 4 vols. Introduction by G. Gregory Smith. 164–7
Spencer's (Herbert) Essays on Education. Intro. by C. W. Eliot. 504
Sterne's Sentimental Journey and Journal and Letters to Eliza. Intro. [by George Saintsbury. 796
(*See also* FICTION)
L Stevenson's In the South Seas and Island Nights' Entertainments. 769
L " Virginibus Puerisque and Familiar Studies of Men and Books. 765
(*See also* FICTION, POETRY *and* TRAVEL)
Swift's Tale of a Tub, The Battle of the Books, etc. 347
(*See also* BIOGRAPHY *and* FOR YOUNG PEOPLE)
Table Talk. Edited by J. C. Thornton. 906
Taylor's (Isaac) Words and Places, or Etymological Illustrations of History, Ethnology, and Geography. Intro. by Edward Thomas. 517
Thackeray's (W. M.) The English Humourists and The Four Georges. Introduction by Walter Jerrold. 610
(*See also* FICTION)
L Thoreau's Walden. Introduction by Walter Raymond. 281
Trench's On the Study of Words and English Past and Present. Introduction by George Sampson. 788
Tytler's Essay on the Principles of Translation. 168
Walton's Compleat Angler. Introduction by Andrew Lang. 70

FICTION

Aimard's The Indian Scout. 428
L Ainsworth's (Harrison) Old St. Paul's. Intro. by W. E. A. Axon. 522
" " The Admirable Crichton. Intro. by E. Rhys. 804
L " " The Tower of London. 400
L " " Windsor Castle. 709
" " Rookwood. Intro. by Frank Swinnerton. 870
American Short Stories of the Nineteenth Century. Edited by John Cournos. 840
L Austen's (Jane) Emma. Introduction by R. B. Johnson. 24
" " Mansfield Park. Introduction by R. B. Johnson. 23
L " " Northanger Abbey and Persuasion. Introduction by R. B. Johnson. 25
L " " Pride and Prejudice. Introduction by R. B. Johnson. 22
L " " Sense and Sensibility. Intro. by R. B. Johnson. 21
Balzac's (Honoré de) Atheist's Mass. Preface by George Saintsbury. 229
" " Catherine de Médici. Introduction by George Saintsbury. 419
" " Christ in Flanders. Introduction by George Saintsbury. 284
" " Cousin Pons. Intro. by George Saintsbury. 463
" " Eugenie Grandet. Intro. by George Saintsbury. 169
" " Lost Illusions. Intro. by George Saintsbury. 656
L " " Old Goriot. Introduction by George Saintsbury. 170
" " The Cat and Racket, and Other Stories. 349
" " The Chouans. Intro. by George Saintsbury. 285
" " The Country Doctor. Intro. George Saintsbury. 530
" " The Country Parson. 686
" " The Quest of the Absolute. Introduction by George Saintsbury. 286
" " The Rise and Fall of César Birotteau. 596
" " The Wild Ass's Skin. Intro. by George Saintsbury. 26
" " Ursule Mirouët. Intro. by George Saintsbury. 733
Barbusse's Under Fire. Translated by Fitzwater Wray. 798

‡ Beaumont's (Mary) Joan Seaton. Intro. by R. F. Horton, D.D. 597
L Bennett's (Arnold) The Old Wives' Tale. 919
L Blackmore's (R. D.) Lorna Doone. 304
‡ „ „ Springhaven. 350
L Borrow's Lavengro. Introduction by Thomas Seccombe. 119
L „ Romany Rye. 120 (*See also* TRAVEL)
L Brontë's (Anne) The Tenant of Wildfell Hall and Agnes Grey. 685
L „ (Charlotte) Jane Eyre. Introduction by May Sinclair. 287
L „ „ Shirley. Introduction by May Sinclair. 288
„ „ The Professor. Introduction by May Sinclair. 417
L „ „ Villette. Introduction by May Sinclair. 351
L „ (Emily) Wuthering Heights. 243
L Burney's (Fanny) Evelina. Introduction by R. B. Johnson. 352
Butler's (Samuel) Erewhon and Erewhon Revisited. Introduction by Desmond MacCarthy. 881
„ „ The Way of All Flesh. Introduction by A. J. Hoppé. 895
Collins' (Wilkie) The Woman in White. 464
L Conrad's Lord Jim. Introduction by R. B. Cunninghame Graham. 925
L Converse's (Florence) Long Will. 328
Dana's (Richard H.) Two Years before the Mast. 588
Daudet's Tartarin of Tarascon and Tartarin on the Alps. 423
Defoe's Fortunes and Misfortunes of Moll Flanders. Introduction by G. A. Aitken. 837
„ Captain Singleton. Introduction by Edward Garnett. 74
„ Journal of the Plague Year. Introduction by G. A. Aitken. 289
„ Memoirs of a Cavalier. Introduction by G. A. Aitken. 283
(*See also* FOR YOUNG PEOPLE) [Chesterton.

CHARLES DICKENS' WORKS. Each volume with an Introduction by G. K.

L American Notes. 290
L Barnaby Rudge. 76
L Bleak House. 236
L Child's History of England. 291
L Christmas Books. 239
L Christmas Stories. 414
L David Copperfield. 242
L Dombey and Son. 240
Edwin Drood. 725
L Great Expectations. 234
Hard Times. 292
L Little Dorrit. 293
L Martin Chuzzlewit. 241
L Nicholas Nickleby. 238
L Old Curiosity Shop. 173
L Oliver Twist. 233
L Our Mutual Friend. 294
L Pickwick Papers. 235
L Reprinted Pieces. 744
Sketches by Boz. 237
L Tale of Two Cities. 102
L Uncommercial Traveller. 536

Disraeli's Coningsby. Introduction by Langdon Davies. 535
Dostoevsky's (Fyodor) Crime and Punishment. Introduction by Laurence Irving. 501
„ „ Letters from the Underworld and Other Tales. Translated by C. J. Hogarth. 654
„ „ Poor Folk and The Gambler. Translated by C. J. Hogarth. 711
„ „ The Possessed. Introduction by J. Middleton Murry. 2 vols. 861–2 [533
„ „ Prison Life in Siberia. Intro. by Madame Stepniak.
„ „ The Brothers Karamazov. Translated by Constance Garnett. 2 vols. 802–3
„ „ The Idiot. 682
Du Maurier's (George) Trilby. Introduction by Sir Gerald du Maurier With the original Illustrations. 863
Dumas' Black Tulip. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 174
„ Chicot the Jester. 421
„ Le Chevalier de Maison Rouge. Intro. by Julius Bramont. 614
„ Marguerite de Valois ('La Reine Margot'). 326
L „ The Count of Monte Cristo. 2 vols. 393–4
„ The Forty-Five. 420
L „ The Three Musketeers. 81
„ The Vicomte de Bragelonne. 3 vols. 593–5
L „ Twenty Years After. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 175
Edgar's Cressy and Poictiers. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 17
„ Runnymede and Lincoln Fair. Intro. by L. K. Hughes. 320
(*See also* FOR YOUNG PEOPLE)
Edgeworth's Castle Rackrent and The Absentee. 410
L Eliot's (George) Adam Bede. 27
„ „ Felix Holt. 353
„ „ Middlemarch. 2 vols. 854–5
L „ „ Mill on the Floss. Intro. Sir W. Robertson Nicoll. 325
L „ „ Romola. Introduction by Rudolf Dircks. 231
L „ „ Scenes of Clerical Life. 468

Eliot's (George) Silas Marner. Introduction by Annie Matheson. 121
L English Short Stories. An Anthology. 743
Erckmann-Chatrian's The Conscript and Waterloo. 354
" " The Story of a Peasant. Translated by C. J. Hogarth. 2 vols. 706–7
Fenimore Cooper's The Deerslayer. 77
" " The Last of the Mohicans. 79
" " The Pathfinder. 78
" " The Pioneers. 171
" " The Prairie. 172
Ferrier's (Susan) Marriage. Introduction by H. L. Morrow. 816
Fielding's Amelia. Intro. by George Saintsbury. 2 vols. 852–3
" Jonathan Wild, and The Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon. Introduction by George Saintsbury. 877
" Joseph Andrews. Introduction by George Saintsbury. 467
L " Tom Jones. Intro. by George Saintsbury. 2 vols. 355–6
Flaubert's Madame Bovary. Translated by Eleanor Marx-Aveling. Introduction by George Saintsbury. 808
" Salammbô. Translated by J. S. Chartres. Introduction by Professor F. C. Green. 869
French Short Stories of the 19th and 20th Centuries. Selected, with an Introduction by Professor F. C. Green. 896
L Galsworthy's (John) The Country House. 917
Galt's Annals of a Parish. Introduction by Baillie Macdonald. 427
Gaskell's (Mrs.) Cousin Phillis, etc. Intro. by Thos. Seccombe. 615
L " Cranford. 83
" Mary Barton. Introduction by Thomas Seccombe. 598
" North and South. 680
" Sylvia's Lovers. Intro. by Mrs. Ellis Chadwick. 524
" Gleig's (G. R.) The Subaltern. 708
Goethe's Wilhelm Meister. Carlyle's Translation. 2 vols. 599–600
(*See also* ESSAYS and POETRY)
Gogol's (Nicol) Dead Souls. Translated by C. J. Hogarth. 726
" " Taras Bulba and Other Tales. 740
L Goldsmith's Vicar of Wakefield. Introduction by J. M. D. 295
(*See also* ESSAYS *and* POETRY)
Goncharov's Oblomov. Translated by Natalie Duddington. 878
Gorki's Through Russia. Translated by C. J. Hogarth. 741
‡ Gotthelf's Ulric the Farm Servant. Ed. with Notes by John Ruskin. 228
Harte's (Bret) Luck of Roaring Camp and other Tales. 681
Hawthorne's The House of the Seven Gables. Intro. by Ernest Rhys. 176
L " The Scarlet Letter. 122
" The Blithedale Romance. 592
" The Marble Faun. Intro. by Sir Leslie Stephen. 424
" Twice Told Tales. 531
(*See also* FOR YOUNG PEOPLE)
L Hugo's (Victor) Les Misérables. Intro. by S. R. John. 2 vols. 363–4
L " " Notre Dame. Introduction by A. C. Swinburne. 422
L " " Toilers of the Sea. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 509
Italian Short Stories. Edited by D. Pettoello. 876
James's (G. P. R.) Richelieu. Introduction by Rudolf Dircks. 357
L James's (Henry) The Turn of the Screw and The Aspern Papers. 912
Kingsley's (Charles) Alton Locke. 462
L " " Hereward the Wake. Intro. by Ernest Rhys. 296
L " " Hypatia. 230
L " " Westward Ho; Introduction by A. G. Grieve. 20
" " Yeast. 611
(*See also* POETRY *and* FOR YOUNG PEOPLE)
" (Henry) Geoffrey Hamlyn. 416
" " Ravenshoe. 28
L Lawrence's (D. H.) The White Peacock. 914
Lever's Harry Lorrequer. Introduction by Lewis Melville. 177
L Loti's (Pierre) Iceland Fisherman. Translated by W. P. Baines. 920
L Lover's Handy Andy. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 178
L Lytton's Harold. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 15
L " Last Days of Pompeii. 80
" Last of the Barons. Introduction by R. G. Watkin. 18
" Rienzi. Introduction by E. H. Blakeney, M.A. 532
(*See also* TRAVEL)
MacDonald's (George) Sir Gibbie. 678
(*See also* ROMANCE)
Manning's Mary Powell and Deborah's Diary. Intro. by Katherine Tynan (Mrs. Hinkson). 324

Manning's Sir Thomas More. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 19
Marryat's Jacob Faithful. 618
L „ Mr. Midshipman Easy. Introduction by R. B. Johnson. 82
„ Percival Keene. Introduction by R. Brimley Johnson. 358
„ Peter Simple. Introduction by R. Brimley Johnson. 232
„ The King's Own. 580
(*See also* FOR YOUNG PEOPLE)
Maupassant's Short Stories. Translated by Marjorie Laurie. Introduction by Gerald Gould. 907
Melville's (Herman) Moby Dick. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 179
„ „ Omoo. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 297
„ „ Typee. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 180
L Meredith's (George) The Ordeal of Richard Feverel. 916
Mérimée's Carmen, with Prévost's Manon Lescaut. Introduction by Philip Henderson. 834
Mickiewicz's (Adam) Pan Tadeusz. 842
‡ Morier's Hajji Baba. 679
Mulock's John Halifax, Gentleman. Introduction by J. Shaylor. 123
Neale's (J.M.) The Fall of Constantinople. 655
‡ Oliphant's (Mrs.) Salem Chapel. Intro. by Sir W Robertson Nicoll. 244
Paltock's (Robert) Peter Wilkins; or, The Flying Indians. Introduction by A. H. Bullen. 676
Pater's Marius the Epicurean. Introduction by Osbert Burdett. 903
Peacock's Headlong Hall and Nightmare Abbey. 327
L Poe's Tales of Mystery and Imagination. Intro. by Padraic Colum. 336
(*See also* POETRY)
Prévost's Manon Lescaut, with Mérimée's Carmen. Introduction by Philip Henderson. 834
Pushkin's (Alexander) The Captain's Daughter and Other Tales. Trans. by Natalie Duddington. 898
Quiller-Couch's (Sir Arthur) Hetty Wesley. 864
Radcliffe's (Ann) Mysteries of Udolpho. Introduction by R. Austin Freeman. 2 vols. 865–6
L Reade's (C.) The Cloister and the Hearth. Intro. by A. C. Swinburne. 29
Reade's (C.) Peg Woffington and Christie Johnstone. 299
Richardson's (Samuel) Pamela. Intro. by G. Saintsbury. 2 vols. 683–4
„ „ Clarissa. Intro. by Prof. W. L. Phelps. 4 vols. 882–5
Russian Authors, Short Stories from. Trans. by R. S. Townsend. 758
Sand's (George) The Devil's Pool and François the Waif. 534
Scheffel's Ekkehard: a Tale of the Tenth Century. 529
Scott's (Michael) Tom Cringle's Log. 710

SIR WALTER SCOTT'S WORKS:

L Abbot, The. 124
Anne of Geierstein. 125
L Antiquary, The. 126
Black Dwarf and Legend of Montrose. 128
Bride of Lammermoor. 129
Castle Dangerous and The Surgeon's Daughter. 130
Count Robert of Paris. 131
L Fair Maid of Perth. 132
Fortunes of Nigel. 71
L Guy Mannering. 133
L Heart of Midlothian, The. 134
Highland Widow and Betrothed. 127
L Ivanhoe. Intro. by Ernest Rhys. 16
L Kenilworth. 135
L Monastery, The. 136
L Old Mortality. 137
Peveril of the Peak. 138
Pirate, The. 139
L Quentin Durward. 140
L Redgauntlet. 141
L Rob Roy. 142
St. Ronan's Well. 143
L Talisman, The. 144
L Waverley. 75
L Woodstock. Intro. by Edward Garnett. 72
(*See also* BIOGRAPHY *and* POETRY)

Shchedrin's The Golovlyov Family. Translated by Natalie Duddington. Introduction by Edward Garnett. 908
Shelley's (Mary Wollstonecraft) Frankenstein. 616
Sheppard's Charles Auchester. Intro. by Jessie M. Middleton. 505
Sienkiewicz (Henryk). Tales from. Edited by Monica M. Gardner. 871
Shorter Novels, Vol. I. Elizabethan and Jacobean. Edited by Philip Henderson. 824
„ „ Vol. II. Jacobean and Restoration. Edited by Philip Henderson. 841
„ „ Vol. III Eighteenth Century (Beckford's Vathek, Walpole's Castle of Otranto, and Dr. Johnson's [Rasselas]. 856
Smollett's Peregrine Pickle. 2 vols. 838–9
„ Roderick Random. Introduction by H. W. Hodges. 790
L Sterne's Tristram Shandy. Introduction by George Saintsbury. 617
(*See also* ESSAYS)

FICTION—*continued*

L Stevenson's Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, The Merry Men, and Other Tales.
L " The Master of Ballantrae and The Black Arrow. 764 [767
L " Treasure Island and Kidnapped. 763
" St. Ives. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 904
(*See also* ESSAYS, POETRY, *and* TRAVEL)
Surtees' Jorrocks' Jaunts and Jollities. 817
L Tales of Detection. Edited, with Introduction, by Dorothy L. Sayers. 928
Thackeray's Rose and the Ring and other stories. Introduction by Walter Jerrold. 359
L " Esmond. Introduction by Walter Jerrold. 73
" Newcomes. Introduction by Walter Jerrold. 2 vols. 465–6
" Pendennis. Intro. by Walter Jerrold. 2 vols. 425–6
" Roundabout Papers. 687
L " Vanity Fair. Introduction by Hon. Whitelaw Reid. 298
" Virginians. Introduction by Walter Jerrold. 2 vols. 507–8
(*See also* ESSAYS)
L Tolstoi's Anna Karenina. Trans. by Rochelle S. Townsend. 2 vols. 612–13
" Childhood, Boyhood, and Youth. Trans. by C. J. Hogarth. 591
" Master and Man, and other Parables and Tales. 469
" War and Peace. 3 vols. 525–7
Trollope's (Anthony) Barchester Towers. 30
" " Dr. Thorne. 360
" " Framley Parsonage. Intro. by Ernest Rhys. 181
" " The Golden Lion of Granpère. Introduction by Hugh Walpole. 761
" " The Last Chronicle of Barset. 2 vols. 391–2
" " Phineas Finn. Intro. by Hugh Walpole. 2 vols. 832–3
" " The Small House at Allington. 361
" " The Warden. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 182
Turgenev's Fathers and Sons. Translated by C. J. Hogarth. 742
" Liza. Translated by W. R. S. Ralston. 677
" Virgin Soil. Translated by Rochelle S. Townsend. 528
L Walpole's (Hugh) Mr. Perrin and Mr. Traill. 918
L Wells's (H. G.) The Time Machine and The Wheels of Chance. 915
Whyte-Melville's The Gladiators. Introduction by J. Mavrogordato. 523
Wood's (Mrs. Henry) The Channings. 84
Yonge's (Charlotte M.) The Dove in the Eagle's Nest. 329
" " The Heir of Redclyffe. Intro. Mrs. Meynell. 362
(*See also* FOR YOUNG PEOPLE)
Zola's (Emile) Germinal. Translated by Havelock Ellis. 897

HISTORY

Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, The. Translated by James Ingram. 624
Bede's Ecclesiastical History, etc. Introduction by Vida D. Scudder. 479
Burnet's History of His Own Times. 85
L Carlyle's French Revolution. Introduction by H. Belloc. 2 vols. 31–2
(*See also* BIOGRAPHY *and* ESSAYS)
L Creasy's Decisive Battles of the World. Introduction by E. Rhys. 300
De Joinville (*See* Villehardouin)
Duruy's (Jean Victor) A History of France. 2 vols. 737–8
Finlay's Byzantine Empire. 33
" Greece under the Romans. 185
Froude's Henry VIII. Intro. by Llewellyn Williams, M.P. 3 vols. 372–4
" Edward VI. Intro. by Llewellyn Williams, M.P., B.C.L. 375
" Mary Tudor. Intro. by Llewellyn Williams, M.P., B.C.L. 477
" History of Queen Elizabeth's Reign. 5 vols. Completing Froude's 'History of England', in 10 vols. 583–7
(*See also* ESSAYS *and* BIOGRAPHY)
Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by Oliphant Smeaton, M.A. 6 vols. 434–6, 474–6
(*See also* BIOGRAPHY)
Green's Short History of the English People. Edited and Revised by L. Cecil Jane, with an Appendix by R. P. Farley, B.A. 2 vols. 727–8
Grote's History of Greece. Intro. by A. D. Lindsay. 12 vols. 186–97
Hallam's (Henry) Constitutional History of England. 3 vols. 621–3
Holinshed's Chronicle as used in Shakespeare's Plays. Introduction by Professor Allardyce Nicoll. 800
Irving's (Washington) Conquest of Granada. 478
(*See also* ESSAYS *and* BIOGRAPHY)
Josephus' Wars of the Jews. Introduction by Dr. Jacob Hart. 712
Lützow's History of Bohemia. 432
L Macaulay's History of England. 3 vols. 34–6
(*See also* ESSAYS *and* ORATORY)

HISTORY—*continued*

Machiavelli's History of Florence. 376 (*See also* ESSAYS)
Maine's (Sir Henry) Ancient Law. 734
Merivale's History of Rome. (An Introductory vol. to Gibbon.) 433
Mignet's (F. A. M.) The French Revolution. 713
Milman's History of the Jews. 2 vols. 377–8
Mommsen's History of Rome. Translated by W. P. Dickson, LL.I
With a review of the work by E. A. Freeman. 4 vols. 542–5
L **Motley's Dutch Republic.** 3 vols. 86–8
Parkman's Conspiracy of Pontiac. 2 vols. 302–3
Paston Letters, The. Based on edition of Knight. Introduction b
Mrs. Archer-Hind, M.A. 2 vols. 752–3
Pilgrim Fathers, The. Introduction by John Masefield. 480
L **Pinnow's History of Germany.** Translated by M. R. Brailsford. 929
Political Liberty, The Growth of. A Source-Book of English History
Arranged by Ernest Rhys. 745
Prescott's Conquest of Mexico. With Introduction by Thomas Seccombe
M.A. 2 vols. 397–8
,, Conquest of Peru. Intro. by Thomas Seccombe, M.A. 301
Sismondi's Italian Republics. 250
Stanley's Lectures on the Eastern Church. Intro. by A. J. Grieve. 25
,, Memorials of Canterbury. 89
Tacitus. Vol. I Annals. Introduction by E. H. Blakeney. 273
,, Vol. II. Agricola and Germania. Intro. by E. H. Blakeney. 27
Thierry's Norman Conquest. Intro. by J. A. Price, B.A. 2 vols. 198–
Villehardouin and De Joinville's Chronicles of the Crusades. Translated
with Introduction, by Sir F. Marzials, C.B. 333
Voltaire's Age of Louis XIV. Translated by Martyn P. Pollack. 780

ORATORY

Anthology of British Historical Speeches and Orations. Compiled b
Ernest Rhys. 714
Bright's (John) Speeches. Selected with Intro. by Joseph Sturge. 252
Burke's American Speeches and Letters. 340
(*See also* ESSAYS)
Demosthenes: Select Orations. 546
Fox (Charles James): Speeches (French Revolutionary War Period
Edited with Introduction by Irene Cooper Willis, M.A. 759
Lincoln's Speeches, etc. Intro. by the Rt. Hon. James Bryce. 206
(*See also* BIOGRAPHY)
Macaulay's Speeches on Politics and Literature. 399
(*See also* ESSAYS *and* HISTORY)
Pitt's Orations on the War with France. 145

PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY

L **A Kempis' Imitation of Christ.** 484
Ancient Hebrew Literature. Being the Old Testament and Apocryph
Arranged by the Rev. R. B. Taylor. 4 vols. 253–6
Aristotle, The Nicomachean Ethics of. Translated by D. P. Chas
Introduction by Professor J. A. Smith. 547
(*See also* CLASSICAL)
Bacon's The Advancement of Learning. 719
(*See also* ESSAYS)
Berkeley's (Bishop) Principles of Human Knowledge, New Theory
Vision. With Introduction by A. D. Lindsay. 483
Boehme's (Jacob) The Signature of All Things, with Other Writing
Introduction by Clifford Bax. 569
Browne's Religio Medici, etc. Introduction by Professor C. H. Herford. 9
Bunyan's Grace Abounding and Mr. Badman. Introduction by G. I
Harrison. 815 (*See also* ROMANCE)
Burton's (Robert) Anatomy of Melancholy. Introduction by Holbroo
Jackson. 3 vols. 886–8
Butler's Analogy of Religion. Introduction by Rev. Ronald Bayne. 9
Descartes' (Rene) A Discourse on Method. Translated by Professor Job
Veitch. Introduction by A. D. Lindsay. 570
L **Ellis' (Havelock) Selected Essays.** Introduction by J. S. Collis. 930
L **Gore's (Charles) The Philosophy of the Good Life.** 924
Hobbes' Leviathan. Edited, with Intro. by A. D. Lindsay, M.A. 69
Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity. Intro. by Rev. H. Bayne. 2 vols. 201–
Hume's Treatise of Human Nature, and other Philosophical Work
Introduction by A. D. Lindsay. 2 vols. 548–9
James (William): Selected Papers on Philosophy. 739
Kant's Critique of Pure Reason. Translated by J. M. D. Meiklejoh
Introduction by Dr. A. D. Lindsay. 909

PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY—*continued*

Keble's The Christian Year. Introduction by J. C. Shairp. 690
King Edward VI. First and Second Prayer Books. Introduction by the Right Rev. Bishop of Gloucester. 448
L Koran, The. Rodwell's Translation. 380
Latimer's Sermons. Introduction by Canon Beeching. 40
Law's Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life. 91
Leibniz's Philosophical Writings Selected and trans. by Mary Morris. Introduction by C. R. Morris, M.A. 905
Locke's Two Treatises of Civil Government. Introduction by Professor William S. Carpenter. 751
Malthus on the Principles of Population. 2 vols. 692–3
Maurice's Kingdom of Christ. 2 vols. 146–7 (Vol. 146‡)
Mill's (John Stuart) Utilitarianism, Liberty, Representative Government. With Introduction by A. D. Lindsay. 482
„ Subjection of Women. (*See* Wollstonecraft, Mary, *under* SCIENCE.)
More's Utopia. Introduction by Judge O'Hagan. 461
L New Testament. Arranged in the order in which the books came to the Christians of the First Century. 93
Newman's Apologia pro Vita Sua. Intro. by Dr. Charles Sarolea. 636
(*See also* ESSAYS)
Nietzsche's Thus Spake Zarathustra. Translated by A. Tille and M. M. Bozman. 892
Paine's Rights of Man. Introduction by G. J. Holyoake. 718
Pascal's Pensées. Translated by W. F. Trotter. Introduction by T. S. Eliot. 874
L Ramayana and the Mahabharata, The. Translated by Romesh Dutt, C.I.E. 403
Renan's Life of Jesus. Introduction by Right Rev. Chas. Gore, D.D. 805
Robertson's (F. W.) Sermons on Religion and Life, Christian Doctrine, and Bible Subjects. Each Volume with Introduction by Canon Burnett. 3 vols. 37–9
Robinson's (Wade) The Philosophy of Atonement and Other Sermons. Introduction by Rev. F. B. Meyer. 637
Rousseau's (J. J.) The Social Contract, etc. 660
(*See also* ESSAYS)
St. Augustine's Confessions. Dr. Pusey's Translation. 200
L St. Francis: The Little Flowers, and The Life of St. Francis. 485
Seeley's Ecce Homo. Introduction by Sir Oliver Lodge. 305
Spinoza's Ethics, etc. Translated by Andrew J. Boyle. With Introduction by Professor Santayana. 481
Swedenborg's (Emmanuel) Heaven and Hell. 379
„ „ The Divine Love and Wisdom. 635
„ „ The Divine Providence. 658
L „ „ The True Christian Religion. 893

POETRY AND DRAMA

Anglo-Saxon Poetry. Edited by Professor R. K. Gordon. 794
Arnold's (Matthew) Poems, 1840–66, including Thyrsis. 334
L Ballads, A Book of British. Selected by R. B. Johnson. 572
Beaumont and Fletcher, The Select Plays of. Introduction by Professor Baker, of Harvard University. 506
Björnson's Plays. Vol. I. The Newly Married Couple, Leonardo, A Gauntlet. Translated by R. Farquharson Sharp. 625
Vol. II. The Editor, The Bankrupt, and The King. „ „ Translated by R. Farquharson Sharp. 696
Blake's Poems and Prophecies. Introduction by Max Plowman. 792
L Browning's Poems, 1833–44. Introduction by Arthur Waugh. 41
L Browning's Poems, 1844–64. 42
L „ The Ring and the Book. Intro. by Chas. W. Hodell. 502
L Burns' Poems and Songs. Introduction by J. Douglas. 94
Byron's Poetical and Dramatic Works. 3 vols. 486–8
Calderon: Six Plays, translated by Edward Fitzgerald. 819
L Chaucer's Canterbury Tales. Edited by Principal Burrell, M.A. 307
Coleridge, Golden Book of. Edited by Stopford A. Brooke. 43
(*See also* ESSAYS)
Cowper (William). Poems of. Edited by H. I'Anson Fausset. 872
(*See also* BIOGRAPHY)
L Dante's Divine Comedy (Cary's Translation). Specially edited by Edmund Gardner. 308
Donne's Poems. Edited by H. I'Anson Fausset. 867
Dryden's Poems. Edited by Bonamy Dobrée. 910
Eighteenth-Century Plays. Edited by John Hampden. 818

Emerson's Poems. Introduction by Professor Bakewell, Yale, U.S.A. 715
Everyman and other Interludes, including eight Miracle Plays. Edited by Ernest Rhys. 381
L Fitzgerald's (Edward) Omar Khayyam and Six Plays of Calderon. 819
L Goethe's Faust. Parts I and II. Trans. and Intro. by A. G. Latham. 335
(*See also* ESSAYS *and* FICTION) [well. 921
L Golden Book of Modern English Poetry, The. Edited by Thomas Cald
L Golden Treasury of Longer Poems, The. Edited by Ernest Rhys. 740
Goldsmith's Poems and Plays. Introduction by Austin Dobson. 415
(*See also* ESSAYS *and* FICTION)
Gray's Poems and Letters. Introduction by John Drinkwater. 628
Hebbel's Plays. Translated with an Introduction by Dr. C. K. Allen. 694
Heine: Prose and Poetry. 911
Herbert's Temple. Introduction by Edward Thomas. 309
‡ Heroic Verse, A Volume of. Arranged by Arthur Burrell, M.A. 574
Herrick's Hesperides and Noble Numbers. Intro. by Ernest Rhys. 310
L Ibsen's Brand. Translated by F. E. Garrett. 716
L „ Ghosts, The Warriors at Helgeland, and An Enemy of the People. Translated by R. Farquharson Sharp. 552
L „ Lady Inger of Ostraat, Love's Comedy, and The League of Youth. Translated by R. Farquharson Sharp. 729
„ Peer Gynt. Translated by R. Farquharson Sharp. 747
L „ A Doll's House, The Wild Duck, and The Lady from the Sea. Translated by R. Farquharson Sharp. 494
L „ The Pretenders, Pillars of Society, and Rosmersholm. Translated by R. Farquharson Sharp. 659
Jonson's (Ben) Plays. Introduction by Professor Schelling. 2 vols. 489–90
Kalidasa: Shakuntala. Translated by Professor A. W. Ryder. 629
L Keats' Poems. 101
Kingsley's (Charles) Poems. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 793
(*See also* FICTION *and* FOR YOUNG PEOPLE)
L Langland's (William) Piers Plowman. 571
Lessing's Laocoön, Minna von Barnhelm, and Nathan the Wise. 843
L Longfellow's Poems. Introduction by Katherine Tynan. 382
L Marlowe's Plays and Poems. Introduction by Edward Thomas. 383
L Milton's Poems. Introduction by W. H. D. Rouse. 384
(*See also* ESSAYS)
Minor Elizabethan Drama. Vol. I. Tragedy. Selected, with Introduction, by Professor Thorndike. Vol. II. Comedy. 491–2
L Minor Poets of the 18th Century. Edited by H. I'Anson Fausset. 844
Minor Poets of the 17th Century. Edited by R. G. Howarth. 873
Molière's Comedies. Introduction by Prof. F. C. Green. 2 vols. 830–1
L New Golden Treasury, The. An Anthology of Songs and Lyrics. 695
Old Yellow Book, The. Introduction by Charles E. Hodell. 503
L Omar Khayyam (The Rubaiyat of). Trans. by Edward Fitzgerald. 819
L Palgrave's Golden Treasury. Introduction by Edward Hutton. 96
Percy's Reliques of Ancient English Poetry. 2 vols. 148–9
Poe's (Edgar Allan) Poems and Essays. Intro. by Andrew Lang. 791
(*See also* FICTION)
Pope (Alexander): Collected Poems. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 760
Procter's (Adelaide A.) Legends and Lyrics. 150
Restoration Plays, A Volume of. Introduction by Edmund Gosse. 604
L Rossetti's Poems and Translations. Introduction by E. G. Gardner. 627
Scott's Poems and Plays. Intro. by Andrew Lang. 2 vols. 550–1
(*See also* BIOGRAPHY *and* FICTION)
L Shakespeare's Comedies. 153
L „ Historical Plays, Poems, and Sonnets. 154
L „ Tragedies. 155
L Shelley's Poetical Works. Introduction by A. H. Koszul. 2 vols. 257–8
L Sheridan's Plays. 95
Spenser's Faerie Queene. Intro. by Prof. J. W. Hales. 2 vols. 443–4
„ Shepherd's Calendar and Other Poems. Edited by Philip Henderson. 879
Stevenson's Poems—A Child's Garden of Verses, Underwoods, Songs of Travel, Ballads. 768
(*See also* ESSAYS, FICTION, *and* TRAVEL)
L Tennyson's Poems. Vol. I, 1830–56. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 44
L „ „ Vol. II, 1857–70. 626 [Harrison. 899
Webster and Ford. Plays. Selected, with Introduction, by Dr. G. B
Whitman's (Walt) Leaves of Grass (1), Democratic Vistas, etc. 573
Wilde (Oscar), Plays, Prose Writings and Poems. 858
L Wordsworth's Shorter Poems. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 203
L „ Longer Poems. Note by Editor. 311

REFERENCE

Atlas of Ancient and Classical Geography. Many coloured and line Maps; Historical Gazetteer, Index, etc. 451
Biographical Dictionary of English Literature. 449
Biographical Dictionary of Foreign Literature. 900
Dates, Dictionary of. 554
Dictionary of Quotations and Proverbs. 2 vols. 809–10.
Everyman's English Dictionary. 776
Literary and Historical Atlas. I. Europe. Many coloured and line Maps; full Index and Gazetteer. 496
" " " II. America. Do. 553
" " " III. Asia. Do. 633
" " " IV. Africa and Australia. Do. 662
Non-Classical Mythology, Dictionary of. 632
Reader's Guide to Everyman's Library. By R. Farquharson Sharp. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 889
Roget's Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases. 2 vols. 630–1.
Smith's Smaller Classical Dictionary. Revised and Edited by E. H. Blakeney, M.A. 495
Wright's An Encyclopaedia of Gardening. 555

ROMANCE

Aucassin and Nicolette, with other Medieval Romances. 497
Boccaccio's Decameron. (Unabridged.) Translated by J. M. Rigg. Introduction by Edward Hutton. 2 vols. 845–6
L Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress. Introduction by Rev. H. E. Lewis. 204
Burnt Njal, The Story of. Translated by Sir George Dasent. 558
L Cervantes' Don Quixote. Motteux' Translation. Lockhart's Introduction. 2 vols. 385–6
Chrétien de Troyes: Eric and Enid. Translated, with Introduction and Notes, by William Wistar Comfort. 698
French Medieval Romances. Translated by Eugene Mason. 557
Geoffrey of Monmouth's Histories of the Kings of Britain. 577
Grettir Saga, The. Newly Translated by G. Ainslie Hight. 699
Gudrun. Done into English by Margaret Armour. 880
Guest's (Lady) Mabinogion. Introduction by Rev. R. Williams. 97
Heimskringla: The Olaf Sagas. Translated by Samuel Laing. Introduction and Notes by John Beveridge. 717
" Sagas of the Norse Kings. Translated by Samuel Laing. Introduction and Notes by John Beveridge. 847
Holy Graal, The High History of the. 445
Kalevala. Introduction by W. F. Kirby, F.L.S., F.E.S. 2 vols. 259–60
Le Sage's The Adventures of Gil Blas. Introduction by Anatole Le Bras. 2 vols. 437–8
MacDonald's (George) Phantastes: A Faerie Romance. 732
(*See also* FICTION)
L Malory's Le Morte d'Arthur. Intro. by Professor Rhys. 2 vols. 45–6
L Morris (William): Early Romances. Introduction by Alfred Noyes. 261
" " The Life and Death of Jason. 575
Morte d'Arthur Romances, Two. Introduction by Lucy A. Paton. 634
Nibelungs, The Fall of the. Translated by Margaret Armour. 312
Rabelais' The Heroid Deeds of Gargantua and Pantagruel. Introduction by D. B. Wyndham Lewis. 2 vols. 826–7
Wace's Arthurian Romance. Translated by Eugene Mason. Layamon's Brut. Introduction by Lucy A. Paton. 578

SCIENCE

Boyle's The Sceptical Chymist. 559
Darwin's The Origin of Species. Introduction by Sir Arthur Keith. 811
(*See also* TRAVEL) [E. F. Bozman. 922
L Eddington's (Sir Arthur) The Nature of the Physical World. Intro. by
Euclid: the Elements of. Todhunter's Edition. Introduction by Sir Thomas Heath, K.C.B. 891
Faraday's (Michael) Experimental Researches in Electricity. 576
Galton's Inquiries into Human Faculty. Revised by Author. 263
George's (Henry) Progress and Poverty. 560
Hahnemann's (Samuel) The Organon of the Rational Art of Healing. Introduction by C. E. Wheeler. 663
Harvey's Circulation of the Blood. Introduction by Ernest Parkyn. 262
Howard's State of the Prisons. Introduction by Kenneth Ruck. 835
Huxley's Essays. Introduction by Sir Oliver Lodge. 47
" Select Lectures and Lay Sermons. Intro. Sir Oliver Lodge. 498
Lyell's Antiquity of Man. With an Introduction by R. H. Rastall. 700

SCIENCE—*continued*

Marx's (Karl) Capital. Translated by Eden and Cedar Paul. Introduction by G. D. H. Cole. 2 vols. 848–9
Miller's Old Red Sandstone. 103
Owen's (Robert) A New View of Society, etc. Intro. by G. D. H. Cole. 798
Ricardo's Principles of Political Economy and Taxation. 590
Smith's (Adam) The Wealth of Nations. 2 vols. 412–13
Tyndall's Glaciers of the Alps and Mountaineering in 1861. 98
White's Selborne. Introduction by Principal Windle. 48
Wollstonecraft (Mary), The Rights of Woman, with John Stuart Mill's The Subjection of Women. 825

TRAVEL AND TOPOGRAPHY

Anson's Voyages. Introduction by John Masefield. 510
Bates' Naturalist on the Amazon. With Illustrations. 446
Belt's The Naturalist in Nicaragua. Intro. by Anthony Belt, F.L.S. 56
Borrow's (George) The Gypsies in Spain. Intro. by Edward Thomas. 69
L ,, ,, The Bible in Spain. Intro. by Edward Thomas. 15
,, ,, Wild Wales. Intro. by Theodore Watts-Dunton. 4
(*See also* FICTION)
Boswell's Tour in the Hebrides with Dr. Johnson. 387
(*See also* BIOGRAPHY)
Burton's (Sir Richard) First Footsteps in East Africa. 500
‡ Calderon de la Barca's (Mme.) Life in Mexico. 664
Cobbett's Rural Rides. Introduction by Edward Thomas. 2 vols. 638-
L Cook's Voyages of Discovery. 99
Crèvecœur's (H. St. John) Letters from an American Farmer. 640
Darwin's Voyage of the Beagle. 104
(*See also* SCIENCE)
Defoe's Tour Through England and Wales. Introduction by G. D. H. [Cole. 820–
(*See also* FICTION)
Dennis' Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria. 2 vols. 183–4
Dufferin's (Lord) Letters from High Latitudes. 499
Ford's Gatherings from Spain. Introduction by Thomas Okey. 152
Franklin's Journey to the Polar Sea. Intro. by Capt. R. F. Scott. 447
Giraldus Cambrensis: Itinerary and Description of Wales. 272
Hakluyt's Voyages. 8 vols. 264, 265, 313, 314, 338, 339, 388, 389
Kinglake's Eothen. Introduction by Harold Spender, M.A. 337
Lane's Modern Egyptians. With many Illustrations. 315
‡ Lytton's Pilgrims of the Rhine. 390
(*See also* FICTION)
Mandeville's (Sir John) Travels. Introduction by Jules Bramont. 812
Park (Mungo): Travels. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 205
Peaks, Passes, and Glaciers. Selected by E. H. Blakeney, M.A. 778
L Polo's (Marco) Travels. Introduction by John Masefield. 306
Roberts' The Western Avernus. Intro. by Cunninghame Graham. 762
L Speke's Discovery of the Source of the Nile. 50
L Stevenson's An Inland Voyage, Travels with a Donkey, and Silverado Squatters. 766
(*See also* ESSAYS, FICTION, *and* POETRY)
Stow's Survey of London. Introduction by H. B. Wheatley. 589
Wakefield's Letter from Sydney and Other Writings on Colonization. 828
Waterton's Wanderings in South America. Intro. by E. Selous. 772
Young's Travels in France and Italy. Intro. by Thomas Okey. 720

FOR YOUNG PEOPLE

‡ Abbott's Rollo at Work and Rollo at Play. Intro. by Lucy Crump. 275
L Æsop's and Other Fables: An Anthology from all sources. 657
L Alcott's Little Men. Introduction by Grace Rhys. 512
L ,, Little Women and Good Wives. Intro. by Grace Rhys. 248
Andersen's Fairy Tales. Illustrated by the Brothers Robinson. 4
,, More Fairy Tales. Illustrated by Mary Shillabeer. 822
Annals of Fairyland. The Reign of King Oberon. 365
,, ,, The Reign of King Cole. 366
,, ,, The Reign of King Herla. 541
Asgard and the Norse Heroes. Translated by Mrs. Boult. 689
Baker's Cast Up by the Sea. 539
L Ballantyne's Coral Island. 245
,, Martin Rattler. 246
,, Ungava. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 276
L Browne's (Frances) Granny's Wonderful Chair. Introduction by Dollie Radford. 112

Bulfinch's (Thomas) The Age of Fable. 472
Legends of Charlemagne. Intro. by Ernest Rhys. 556
Canton's A Child' Book of Saints. Illustrated by T. H. Robinson. 61
(*See also* ESSAYS)
Carroll's Alice in Wonderland, Through the Looking-Glass, etc. Illustrated by the Author. Introduction by Ernest Rhys. 836
Clarke's Girlhood of Shakespeare's Heroines. 3 vols. 109-11
" Tales from Chaucer. 537
Collodi's Pinocchio; or, The Story of a Puppet. 538
Converse's (Florence) The House of Prayer. 923 (*See also* FICTION)
Cox's (Sir G. W.) Tales of Ancient Greece. 721
Defoe's Robinson Crusoe. Illustrated by J. A. Symington. 59
(*See also* FICTION)
Dodge's (Mary Mapes) Hans Brinker; or, The Silver Skates. 620
Edgar's Heroes of England. 471
(*See also* FICTION)
Ewing's (Mrs.) Jackanapes, Daddy Darwin's Dovecot, illustrated by R. Caldecott, and The Story of a Short Life. 731
Mrs. Overtheway's Remembrances. 730
Fairy Gold. Illustrated by Herbert Cole. 157
Fairy Tales from the Arabian Nights. Illustrated. 249
Freeman's Old English History for Children. 540
Froissart's Chronicles. 57
Gatty's Parables from Nature. Introduction by Grace Rhys. 158
Grimm's Fairy Tales. Illustrated by R. Anning Bell. 56
Hawthorne's Wonder Book and Tanglewood Tales. 5
(*See also* FICTION)
Howard's Rattlin the Reefer. Introduction by Guy Pocock. 857
Hughes' Tom Brown's School Days. Illustrated by T. Robinson. 58
Ingelow's (Jean) Mopsa the Fairy. Illustrated by Dora Curtis. 619
Jefferies's (Richard) Bevis, the Story of a Boy. Introduction by Guy Pocock. 850
Kingsley's Heroes. Introduction by Grace Rhys. 113
" Madam How and Lady Why. Introduction by C. I. Gardiner, [M.A. 777
" Water Babies and Glaucus. 277
(*See also* POETRY *and* FICTION)
Kingston's Peter the Whaler. 6
" Three Midshipmen. 7
Lamb's Tales from Shakespeare. Illustrated by A. Rackham. 8
(*See also* BIOGRAPHY *and* ESSAYS)
Lear (and Others): A Book of Nonsense. 806
Marryat's Children of the New Forest. 247
" Little Savage. Introduction by R. Brimley Johnson. 159
" Masterman Ready. Introduction by R. Brimley Johnson. 160
" Settlers in Canada. Introduction by R. Brimley Johnson. 370
" (Edited by) Rattlin the Reefer. 857
(*See also* FICTION)
Martineau's Feats on the Fjords, etc. Illustrated by A. Rackham. 429
Mother Goose's Nursery Rhymes. Illustrated. 473
Poetry Book for Boys and Girls. Edited by Guy Pocock. 894
Reid's (Mayne) The Boy Hunters of the Mississippi. 582
" " The Boy Slaves. Introduction by Guy Pocock. 797
Ruskin's The Two Boyhoods and Other Passages. 688
(*See also* ESSAYS)
Sewell's (Anna) Black Beauty. Illustrated by Lucy Kemp-Welch. 748
Spyri's (Johanna) Heidi. Illustrations by Lizzie Lawson. 431
Stowe's Uncle Tom's Cabin. 371
Swift's Gulliver's Travels. Illustrated by A. Rackham. 60
(*See also* BIOGRAPHY *and* ESSAYS)
Swiss Family Robinson. Illustrations by Chas. Folkard. 430
Verne's (Jules) Abandoned. 50 Illustrations. 368
" " Dropped from the Clouds. 50 Illustrations. 367
" " Five Weeks in a Balloon and Around the World in Eighty Days. Translated by Arthur Chambers and P. Desages.
" " Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea. 319 [779
" " The Secret of the Island. 50 Illustrations. 369
Yonge's (Charlotte M.) The Book of Golden Deeds. 330
" " The Lances of Lynwood. Illustrated by Dora Curtis. 579
" " The Little Duke. Illustrated by Dora Curtis. 470
(*See also* FICTION)

PUBLISHERS:

J. M. DENT & SONS LTD.
ALDINE HOUSE · BEDFORD STREET
LONDON W.C.2

E. P. DUTTON & COMPANY INC.
286-302 FOURTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

UNIVERSITY

Made in Great Britain at The Temple Press, Letchworth, Herts (Kj 504